



NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Bethesda, Maryland







6341  
**DISCUSSIONS**

**BETWEEN SEVERAL MEMBERS OF  
THE REGULAR MEDICAL FACULTY,**

**AND**

**THE THOMSONIAN BOTANIC PHYSICIANS,**

**ON THE**

*Comparative merits of their respective Systems.*

*L. H. Bailey*

"Error is harmless, where truth is left free to combat it."  
Jefferson.

---

**EDITED AND PUBLISHED**

**BY DR. A. CURTIS.**

**Teacher of Botanico-Medical Science.**

---

**Printed at the Office of the Thomsonian Recorder,**

**BY JONATHAN PHILLIPS.**

---

220335

**COLUMBUS, OHIO,**

**1836.**

St. Anne's

— — — — —

## PREFACE.

Though I have copied the favorite motto of Jefferson, "Error is harmless, where truth is left free to combat it," I must remark that, so numerous and powerful are the prejudices against truth, and so great is the unwillingness of most minds to embrace it when presented, that this "wise saying" is subject to many exceptions and limitations which make it exceedingly desirable that error should never be spread before the public mind, even under circumstances the most favorable for its counteraction. Still, if it *must be* disseminated, nothing can be more desirable than that truth should be "close at its heels."

Though the following discussions, first published in sundry political newspapers, in different parts of the United States, are now re-published in a more compact and permanent form, at the earnest solicitation of the friends of the Thomsonian System; yet, as they contain also, entire, all the arguments brought against it by its regular opponents; we have reason to expect that the latter will subscribe as largely to their distribution, as the former have done.

We have further reason to expect the co-operation of "regular physicians" in the dissemination of this work, in the fact that Dr. Deloney boasts of having demolished our system, which Dr. "Medicus" intimates is worse than the cholera, and that Dr. Williams says, "All I would ask, is for it to

be placed in the hands of the public." Surely *these* gentlemen will aid us with all their might.

A Southern Correspondent of the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, says, (vol. xi. pa. 215,) "Let scientific Physicians discountenance this (Thomsonian) quackery through the medium of Journals &c.," and the editor of that paper says, (vol. xii. pa. 308,) "We perfectly agree in sentiment with the talented author of the review" [Dr. Deloney's, of our lectures, page —.] We expect that the Journal will earnestly recommend to physicians to scatter our book all over the United States.

Those gentlemen will here see that Drs. Williams, Medicus and Deloney have put a strong hand to this work, and of course we shall depend on them for the *gratuitous* distribution of many hundreds of copies. Dr. Miller of the Baltimore Almshouse too, will doubtless use his powerful influence, to aid us in our benevolent exertions to expose this destructive "*Thomsonalgia*" to the "enlightened circle in which he moves."

With the exception of the two Baltimore Lectures, which contain something like a connected, fair and full view of the two Medical Systems, their comparative merits, and the conduct of their advocates, the Botanic writers contented themselves with keeping, pretty generally, in the path marked out by their *regular* opponents, satisfied rather to take them in the snares of their own setting, than to dig new pits for their capture.

EDITOR.

**DR. WILLIAMS'S REMARKS,**  
**IN THE**  
**HOUSE OF DELEGATES OF MARYLAND,**  
**ON THE BILL TO INCORPORATE THE**  
**THOMSONIAN NATIONAL INFIRMARY.**  
*March, 1835.*

**MR. SPEAKER:**—Being entirely unaccustomed to public speaking, and feeling inadequate to do that justice to the subject under consideration, which would have been done it by those whose seats I am sorry to see unoccupied, it is with great reluctance I rise on this floor, in the midst of those who have so often entertained, and who are so able to entertain this house with their eloquence, to present, in my feeble manner, the views I entertain in regard to it. But, as one of the committee to whom this bill was referred, and who concurred, both in the conclusions and details of the report presented by the very intelligent, high-minded and honorable chairman, I feel bound in duty to the majority of that committee, in duty to the citizens of my State, and in duty to my own opinion, to say something, or attempt to say something in support of that report. What, sir, is the subject now before this house? It is the bill to incorporate certain men, their associates and successors, to practise the healing art, on the Thomsonian System. Is this, sir, the real object, or is there not something behind the curtain? Is this merely intended for the benefit of the few individuals who

come here and apply for this act of incorporation, and to be confined within the limits of Baltimore! Do not these men get paid for their medicine and their services? I am sure they may sell as much medicine as they choose, and obtain as much as they can sell. This, in my humble opinion, is not the principal object. It is, sir, to obtain legislative sanction; to obtain a character for their system. And what, sir, will be the consequences of passing this bill? This legislature will have said, virtually, to the citizens of this State and to the world, we have examined this subject, and have compared this Thomsonian System with that which is denominated the regular scientific system, to practise which, it is required by the laws of this State, that all practitioners shall have pursued a certain course of preparatory studies, and have obtained from competent judges such testimonials of their acquirements and qualifications as will afford some security to the community against imposition. (And here, sir, I wish to impress on the minds of the members of this house, that this provision was not intended for the benefit of any privileged order of men, but to protect society and advance the science of medicine.) And, having thus examined and compared those systems, we are prepared to say that the Thomsonian System is a distinct and perfect system, adequate to meet all the varied indications of disease, and worthy of your confidence and patronage. Sir, under the influence of this legislative recommendation, which will be trumpeted forth to the world as such, and deluded by the boasting and specious, but false pretensions of this system, hundreds of our virtuous and really well disposed citizens will be induced to leave those peaceful and innocent em-

ployments which they are now pursuing, and to which they are better fitted both by nature and education, to enter upon the practice of the healing art. And, sir, not only these, but numbers who care not what they do, whether evil or good, for gain, men destitute of intelligence, good sense or moral worth, who can raise twenty dollars for a Thomsonian book, which is really all that is necessary to qualify them, will take advantage of that credulity and misplaced confidence on the part of a large portion of our citizens, which our legislative proceedings will have produced, and which will pre-eminently fit them for that awful experiment which will certainly be made. Pass this law, or any such law, and you may pass such a one for every county in the State; for what reason or justice would there be in denying those inestimable advantages to some which have been extended to others? Now, sir, what is this system for which we are called upon to say so much; to recommend so strongly? Is it worthy of such commendation? How many of us know any thing about it, either practically or theoretically?

Sir, I have this system, if a system it can be called, and I believe I have spent as long a time, perhaps a longer time in studying it, than the learned and no doubt, sir, very skilful and successful agent from whom I obtained it, thought necessary to qualify me to enter upon the very important and highly responsible duties of a physician—that was about a week. And now, sir, as a matter of course, having had this work a much longer time, and previously possessed some knowledge of the human system, the diseases to which it is subject, the principal remediate agents which have been or are now used, and the history of their

application and mode of operation, it will, I hope, at least be conceded to me, that I ought to know something of the merits of the system. This system originated with a man of the name of Thomson, who, according to his own narrative, was born in obscurity and bred in ignorance.

It appears that his early life was characterized by two very remarkable dispositions—one was a curiosity to learn the qualities and names of plants, the other an unconquerable repugnance to work; and I very much suspect, sir, that it was to the latter of these remarkable dispositions, which has no doubt been well cherished, the world is indebted for his admirable system. But, whatever may have been the peculiarities of his early years, his after life has proved him to be one of the most bold and reckless experimenters with human life and happiness, that ever attempted the practice of the healing art.

Sir, I shall not attempt to expose all the errors, inconsistencies and preposterous absurdities of this pretended system, for several reasons. One is, they are entirely too numerous and the time of this house is too precious to be thus wasted; another is, as a system, whatever claims some of the remedies used may possess, it is too contemptible to require a general, or to be honored with a grave and serious refutation. But, for the information of this house, I will notice some of its principles and practice, and expose some of its errors and absurdities.

It professes to be founded on these assumed facts. First, that the human body is composed of four elements—earth, water, fire and air; that earth and water form the solids, and fire and air give life and motion. Second, that heat is life,



and cold is death. Third, that all constitutions are the same. Fourth, that cold produces all diseases. Fifth, that obstruction produces all diseases. Sixth, that all diseases are to be cured by the same remedy. Seventh, that fever is a friend of the human system, and not an enemy. I am well aware, sir, how difficult it is to present these errors, inconsistencies and absurdities, in their true light, even before this intelligent assembly. I know there are but few of us who have directed our minds to the investigation of the subject under consideration, who are acquainted with all those established facts, and possess that information which would at once render those errors, inconsistencies and absurdities apparent. I am well aware that the very name and pretension to simplicity, possesses a talismanic charm, which philosophy and logic do not possess over the minds and opinions of those who cannot understand. To attempt to show the absurdities of this system by logical reasoning, would be in many cases, to offer an insult to human understanding and intelligence. As to the first fact or assumption, every intelligent or scientific individual knows that, instead of the human body being composed of four elements, the analyzing hand of science has proven to the world that it is composed of almost four times four elements; that some of those which were once believed elementary principles, are compounds, and that others are only the phenomena of matter, or the mere result of life and organization. As to the discovery that heat is life, and cold, death, the proposition of itself is absurd. If it be meant that heat is the primary cause of life, and if this be so, it is only necessary to preserve health and to protract human existence to an indefinite length, to con-

fine man in a warm and well regulated temperature, and give him No. 6 or red pepper. That cold produces all diseases, is another fundamental principle of this system. Cold undoubtedly is a very fruitful source of disease, but it is not the universal cause. Heat also produces disease of the most threatening character; and I have no doubt, sir, that I can kill a patient with heat or steam, as soon as a Thomsonian could destroy him with cold, or freeze him to death. It is also stated that obstructions occasion disease. This is not unfrequently the case. But I should rather think disease is more frequently the cause of obstructions. Every organ in the human body has a function or duty to perform, and as every organ is subject to disease, no rational being can suppose that its ordinary function will not be suspended or imperfectly performed. Sir, the exciting and predisposing causes of disease are too numerous to be here detailed. Every physical agent which operates upon us, as well as numerous others, as the causes of small pox and cholera, the intimate nature of which are inscrutable, and which we only know by their melancholy effects, produce disease. And, sir, the cause of disease may exist in the human system itself from constitutional defects, and thus the germs of disease are often planted before the first breath of life is drawn. A blow on the head, or the long continued influence of the rays of the sun, may and will produce an inflammation of the brain. Send for the Thomsonian; he tells you your disease is produced by cold; and, in the delirium occasioned by a violent inflammation, may give you a puke and steam you to expel the cold. Or, suppose you have taken powdered glass, or any other agent, which, from its

physical or chemical qualities, has occasioned a violent inflammation of the inner coats of the stomach, and what is the remedy? Why, you are stuffed with cayenne pepper, steamed and puked, to dislodge imaginary canker and cold. This system tells us that all constitutions are the same, and that all diseases are to be cured by the same remedy, and that fever is a friend of the human system, and not an enemy, and of course should be promoted or encouraged, instead of resisted or opposed. That all constitutions are the same, is what no intelligent being can for one moment believe. Sir, human constitutions are as various as human forms and dispositions, and are as liable to as great a variety of diseases, and require a treatment equally as various. This doctrine of fevers, like many other things in this system, is not new. It prevailed in the very infancy of medical science, and gave rise to practice similar to this, and which, in many diseases, produced the most fatal consequences. The influence of this erroneous theory, and similar practices, was peculiarly evident in the small pox; under a highly stimulating treatment; scarcely one half of those who were attacked were saved. But what is the result of the present systematic plan of cure? Sir, it as been met by science and philosophy, and not one case in ten on an average is now lost. Thus we see, sir, that the very foundation is false, contrary to established facts, and preposterously absurd. What are we to expect of the superstructure? Now, sir, let us notice the materia medica of this system, of the remediate agents used under those monstrous views of human organization and disease, which we have exposed. The principal are Lobelia or Indian Tobacco, which is an eme-

is known or ever has been known of diseases. It includes in its expanded arms every remedy, whether of the animal, mineral or vegetable kingdom, that a beneficent Providence has been pleased to bestow on the world, and which experience has proved capable of removing disease or mitigating the sufferings of mankind. This, I contend, is the only rational system of medicine.

Now, then, compare the system, founded on established facts, philosophic research, and the experience of two thousand years—each successive generation improving on the attainments of the past, cultivated by men of the brightest genius, most brilliant talents and of moral worth, and conscious of the high responsibilities under which they acted, with the erroneously predicated, absurdly sustained, imperfect system of Thomson; originating with and perfected by one obscure individual who knew nothing of the organization of the human body, who never saw one half of the diseases which afflict our race, or one tenth of the remediate agents which have been found successful in the relief and cure of disease, and decide between them.

What, sir, has been the result of the cultivation and practice of the scientific system of medicine? Diseases which once threatened to depopulate the world, the very name of which produced horror in the minds of men, under the influence and science of medicine, have been rendered far less fatal, and some entirely, others almost entirely robbed of that terror by which, with more unerring certainty they destroyed the trembling victim. And, notwithstanding civilization, with her concomitants, luxury and refinement, has tended much to weaken and render more delicate the human con-

stitution, subjecting it to diseases which were formerly unknown, it is computed that human existence has been extended on an average about five years. Sir, the regular system of medicine has been denounced as founded upon theory and speculation. This is a mistake.

From settled facts and the known operation of the laws of nature, every man has a right to form, and will form some notion of the cause, intimate nature, and influence of what is brought under his observation; and other things being equal, the man of intelligence, who is acquainted with the facts and the experience of others in relation to any subject, is more likely to be correct. It is true, sir, that many men, under mistaken and enthusiastic notions, anxious to advance the science, or ambitious of fame, departing from those settled rules or laws for the advancement of science, philosophic investigation, and sound and legitimate deduction, have wandered far into the unproductive regions of speculation and hypothesis. Yes, sir, those established principles and settled facts of the medical science, the application of those settled rules under which it is cultivated, with the touch-stone of cautious experiment, in the hands of scientific, intelligent, conscientious men, like the refiner's furnace, have separated the dross from the mass presented, and if any pure gold has been found, added it to the stock previously possessed—and if only the fact that all was error, that alone is valuable, as a warning to the theorist, a beacon to the course of the skilful practitioner, and one more safeguard to secure mankind.

Sir, it has been attempted to repel the imputation of quackery and empiricism contained in the report. I think I have proved to the satisfaction

of every individual in this house; and if I have not, I here assert, on the responsibility of a member of this house, and on my own responsibility as a member of society, without the fear of successful contradiction, that this system is a boastful pretention to what it does not possess; that it affects to teach what its author never understood, and is calculated, under the specious pretension of simplicity and unerring certainty, to impose on a large portion of mankind. And if this does not stamp it with the character of quackery, the common acceptance of the word is incorrect. And, sir, if the entire independence and ignorance of, and contempt for all past experience in an author, and the establishment of a system upon his own limited experience, and by mad experiments, entitles it to the character of empirical, this pretended system richly merits it, and I humbly conceive no one can successfully dispute its claims. It is said that very intelligent and correct men approve of this system, subscribe to it and practise it; and that the terms quacks and empirics are applied harshly to them. Sir, there is no one less disposed than I am to cast reflections and imputations upon, or wound the feelings of individuals; but if they will connect themselves with, and stand forth to support this system, they are liable to the same imputations to which the system itself is obnoxious. It is also said that learned physicians sanction and approve the Thomsonian System, and have decided in its favor. Sir, that any intelligent physician or scientific man, that is perfectly sane, however willing he may be to acknowledge that some of the remedies used and some of the means employed are valuable, and may in many cases be successfully applied, which I do not deny, can re-

cognize this as a new and distinct system of medicine, perfect in itself, and capable, as it professes to be, of answering all the various indications of disease, and sanction its principles, its falsehoods, abuses and absurdities, I hold to be utterly impossible.

Sir, tell me of the man who is acquainted with the advantages of civilized life, who has felt the genial influence of the light of science and tasted the pleasures of truly refined society, preferring the destitute, barbarous and benighted condition of the Hottentot, or a native of some of the South Sea Islands—tell me of the skilful and experienced mariner who has often seen the ocean wrought into mountain waves by the tyrant storm, and who knows that dangerous shoals and rocks lie hid beneath its surge, throwing away his compass, his quadrant and his chart, and committing himself to the mercy of the waves and the winds, without a landmark or a beacon to guide his course towards the destined port, over the trackless sea—but tell me not of any learned physician recommending this monstrous system to the world.

Mr. Speaker, this system professes to be perfectly simple and intelligible to all; to be reduced to the comprehension of the most humble intellect—and all, sir, I would ask is, for it to be placed in the hands of the public. I feel no doubt that there is sufficient intelligence in this house, if it can be brought to bear on the subject, to compare this system with reason, established facts and experience, and to reject it, as false in its premises, setting up claims and pretensions which cannot be sustained, and from obvious imperfections, slander, abuse and indecencies, utterly disgusting.

Sir, in order to give the house some notion of

the nature of this system, and the mind and principles of the author, I beg the indulgence of this house to read some extracts of this celebrated work. Sir, I am going to read some of the commencement of his treatise on obstetrics, one of the most important branches of medical science, on a proper knowledge, of which not unfrequently the life of mother and child depend. Thomson says, "This is a very difficult subject to write upon, as I know of no words that would be proper to make use of, to convey the necessary information to enable a person to practise with safety."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I ask the members of this house, this grave and intelligent assembly, whether they are prepared, by any act of legislative sanction, to recommend to their fellow-citizens and the world, this pretended system of medicine, with all its boasting pretensions, its imperfections and preposterous absurdities, and all its abuse and vile slander, intended to prejudice the mind of the people against the regularly educated physicians, and which I do contend, is as much a part of this system, as steaming and red pepper.

Sir, are we prepared to pronounce the experience of all those who have devoted their lives and talents to the study and practice of medicine, for the last five thousand years, under a deep sense of the responsibility under which they acted, entirely worthless? Are we prepared to usher a host of ignorant, boasting pretenders upon the community, without the guaranty that they know even a part of that imperfect system, and the diseases which affect it, and destitute of every qualification but the proof of having paid twenty dollars for a Thomsonian book?



Sir, let us pass this bill, or any similar one, and we do all this. I am now willing to submit this subject to the intelligence, justice and humanity of this grave assembly, and take my seat.

---

✂ Having observed in the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, the foregoing speech, I addressed the following reply to the Editor:

"Give us facts—We repeat the invitation—and be in readiness to sustain them, and we care not how much medical iniquity is exposed, nor who swings upon Haman's gallows. When fair statements are presented, with an avowal of the authorship, no willingness will be manifested to conceal abuses, or barricade the falsely acquired reputation of a medical manœuverer. \* \*. Our columns are open to whatever can promote merit, or better the physical condition of mankind."—*Easton Medical and Surgical Journal*, Vol. 12, page 192.

MR. EDITOR: I deem the above, selected from many excellent remarks, a sufficient apology for the following attempt to correct some of the many errors which Doctor Williams has committed, in his zealous crusade against what he styles the "false and preposterously absurd system" of Dr. Samuel Thomson. I remark, in general, that his whole speech, to say the least of it, is a tissue of *assertions* as "bold and reckless" as he would have us believe are the "experiments" of Thomson. I shall not, like the Doctor, deal in generals, and content myself with making proofless assertions. I shall expose his "medical iniquity," by giving you "facts;" not merely on "the authority of my name;" they shall be proved by evidence accessible to all, and arguments which carry on their face the impress of truth.

The Doctor begins by asking, "What is the object" of the petitioners, as exhibited in "the

bill!" [See Appendix.] He then answers the question, by stating that "it is to obtain legislative sanction—a character for their system:"—and then intimates that a charter is unnecessary to secure to them the privileges due to every citizen, viz: of employing whom they please to cure their diseases, and of securing to the laborer the reward of his services. If the Doctor is worthy of the seat he occupies in the hall of legislation, he well knows that the laws of Maryland secure all the pay for medical services, to his order of men whom they have heretofore privileged, as he says the Thomsonians wish to be. If, therefore, the Thomsonians "get paid for their services," it is the gratitude of the patients, not the force of the law, that produces this result. The tendency of the law is, to *punish* those who receive this reward. But, let us admit what the Doctor seems anxious to prove, that the Thomsonians wish to obtain "legislative *sanction* for their system;" [a character it has and will maintain, in spite of all the laws that can be made against it.] Will "the passage of the bill, be saying to the citizens of that State and to the world, 'We have examined the subject, and compared this Thomsonian System with that which is denominated the Scientific System, and are prepared to say that it is a distinct and *perfect* one, adequate to meet *all the varied* indications of disease, and worthy of your confidence and patronage?" If this specious flourish of rhetoric proves any thing for the Doctor, it proves too much. It proves that when the Legislature granted the charter of "the Baltimore Medical College," and made laws to encourage the Scientific System of which he is an advocate, and to exclude from the exercise of the healing art, all

to whom the professors of this system have not given a diploma, it said to the world, "We have examined *this subject* ; compared the theories and practices of *the present day*, with the thousand and one *that have preceded them*, and are prepared to say that the doctrines to be taught by *this college*, and the practices to be pursued by *its pupils*, are a *perfect system*, adequate to meet *all* the various indications of disease, and worthy of your confidence and patronage!!" However ignorant any of the Maryland legislators may be, they certainly all know better than that. Yet, Dr. W. himself says, "there are few of us [legislators] who have directed our minds to the investigation of this subject, and who are acquainted with all the established facts" in medicine. He intimates (in a part of his speech which you have not published) that it would require the study of an ordinary life, to understand the scientific practice so well as to be able to judge of its comparative merits; whereas, he says, "having had this work [of Thomson] a much longer time, [than "about a week,"] and previously possessing some knowledge of the human system, the diseases to which it is liable, the principal remediate agents which have been or are now used, and the history of their application and mode of operation, I ought to know something of the merits of this system." So indeed he ought. But, if a knowledge of the systems they encourage (or rather permit to stand or fall according to public estimation of their merits; which is the *principal* thing the Thomsonians asked) be necessary in the Maryland legislators, it is much easier, according to the Doctor's own statement, to obtain what the Thomsonian System demanded, than what his system had professedly required, and ob-

tained in the grant of the aforesaid charter. But this the Doctor well knew was not asked, (and we mention it only to show the sophistry of his reasoning.) All that the Thomsonians asked, was rights and privileges equal to those enjoyed by other men:—The right to employ and pay whom they please, and to demand remuneration for personal services voluntarily engaged. The merits of the two systems will be determined by their fruits.

To require the Thomsonian System to be “perfect—capable of answering all the varied indications of disease,” before it shall be treated with the same civility that we accord to his “art of conjecture,” his “system of guessing,” “learned quackery,” &c., as Abercrombie, Waterhouse and other eminent physicians, have styled it, is another piece of medical chicanery which deserves to be exposed. The Thomsonians do not pretend that their system is “perfect—adequate to all the varied indications of disease.” They only say, and they prove it by their practice, that it is much better than “what is denominated the regular scientific system.”

Dr. W. says, “Thomson’s life has proved him to be one of the most bold and reckless experimenters with human life and happiness, that ever attempted the practice of the healing art.”

Yet he well knows that the action on the human system, of all the 20,000 “remedial agents” of his own favorite *materia medica*, was discovered either by accident or experiment—indeed the best philosophy of the present age, is at war with every theory that is not based upon experience. If it was wrong in Dr. Thomson to experiment with a few articles, (he mentions eight, and says “there

are a few other domestic old woman remedies,") what shall we say of the conduct of the whole medical faculty, who, for four thousand years, have experimented with more than 20,000? If it was "bold and reckless" in Dr. Thomson to experiment on himself with some "eight or ten" innocent articles, "the mildest of their class," what shall we think of *their* experimenting on all the generations of mankind, with all the rankest poisons they could find in the animal, vegetable and mineral kingdoms? "I find in medical writings," says Dr. William Cullen, "forty different remedies recommended for this disease; and yet I have had forty patients on whom no one had the desired effect."  $40 \times 40 = 1600$  experiments by one head man, on a single disease! What must be the number of the whole faculty, on 2500 diseases? But Thomson's experiments were neither "bold nor reckless." They were performed first on himself. ("I learned, says he, the medical qualities of plants [that were not known to be innocent and good] by tasting") and next on patients whom the medical faculty had given over to die—cases in which they themselves admit that the most desperate experiments (and fatal as *they* often make them) are allowable, if not commendable. "Desperate cases," said a physician, "require a bold practice:" so he threw a shovel full of hot embers on a patient's breast! Another, under the exercise of the same faith, administered arsenic enough to kill a dozen rats!

Dr. Thomson's experiments were performed with modes and means that could do no harm, if no good; and the result was almost always happy. We challenge, *any* where and *every* where, a comparison of the good and evil results of the practice

of the two systems. This is the evidence on which both the people and their representatives in the legislative assemblies, will yet judge of their merits. Dr. W.'s attempt to smother an examination into these matters, is another piece of "medical iniquity," which I trust, Mr. Editor, you will not be "unwilling to expose."

He says that Dr. Thomson's System is founded on the facts (among others that may be disputed) that "heat is life and cold death; that all constitutions are the same and all diseases the same; that cold produces all diseases, and that obstructions produce all diseases; that all diseases are to be cured by the same remedy, and that fever is a friend, not an enemy to the system." As the doctor does not pretend to understand what is meant by some of these positions, I shall notice now, only his perversions of others, which he professed "to know something about."

We will thank him to prove, *by honest quotations*, that Dr. Thomson attributes *all* diseases to either cold or obstructions, while we maintain what needs no proof, that there is no life without heat, or disease without obstructions. The "small pox" is a canker which obstructs the circulation of the fluids; the "cholera" is cold, (which contracts the extreme vessels, and thus obstructs the circulation of the blood and heat,) and occasional efforts of nature to overcome which contraction, produce spasmodic actions of the muscular system, particularly the coats of the stomach and intestines.—The "blow on the head" bruises the vessels and "obstructs" the circulation, and so does "the powdered glass" affect the lining membrane of the stomach. Let us go a little beyond the Doctor's random missiles. The subject is too interesting to be dropped here.

Particles of undigested food are often found in the lacteals and secretory vessels, and, in their passage through the pores of the system, so irritate them as to cause contractions. These contractions are obstructions to the disengagement of the morbid matter which arrests the circulation, produces swelling of the part, becomes canker, and accumulates, till it forms what the Doctors call boils, tumours, abscesses, &c. Before this takes place, however, the man is sick. The natural heat of the body being obstructed in its general diffusion and discharge, accumulates at the surface, and the *effect* is called fever. If now Dr. W. be called, he will *probably*—[they do not all practise alike, these “regulars”—their practice is like an Indian fight, not at a general word of command, but each one shoots arrows or hatchets, *dipped in poison*, from behind his suspended parchment, in the best way he can]—I say, *probably* he will bleed, give “*sub mur. hydr.*” [calomel] and “*ol. ricini*” [caster oil,] which will reduce the heat of the system, increase the contraction, and hold the obstructions faster. In the use of these and other depletives, of refrigeratives and starvation, he will persevere, till the patient has in him neither blood nor heat enough to make a fever. If he ever recover, it will be only to wander about, as Dr. Good says, “with stiff, incurvated limbs, a total loss of teeth, &c., till death, with a friendly stroke, puts a period to his sufferings.”—[Studies of Med. vol. 1, page 179.]

If a Thomsonian be called, he will give cayenne or No. 2 enough to heat the system thoroughly, [increasing the fever to its crisis!] steam enough to open the pores, No. 3 enough to disengage the obstructions, and No. 1 enough to cast them out

of the system. Then, with cold vinegar, or water, he will tone the surface, and with bitters, the digestive and secretive organs, and the man is right again, without the danger of sometime hence requiring a surgeon to lance the boil or abscess, or extract the tumour.

A gentleman afflicted much as above described, called a learned physician, who prescribed sixty grains of calomel, &c. He took it, and soon lost, not only his general health, but almost all sensation in his limbs. He called again on the Doctor, who said "he did not know what the devil ailed him." He then called a Thomsonian, who raised the heat, steamed out the cold, mercury and canker, and cast out the phlegm, gave him bitters, and restored him to sound health. Three days ago, I saw a gentleman in a high fever, alternating with cold chills, great soreness and weakness of the limbs, rheumatic pains, ejecting bile, &c., from the stomach. He was immediately treated with cayenne, steamed, puked, fed, &c., in short, every thing was opposed *but the fever*—that was *aided*! In three hours he went home entirely free from all his bad symptoms but the weakness, and in two days was as strong as usual and perfectly well. Was the fever a friend or an enemy?

"But," says Dr. W. "this System tells us that all constitutions are the same." So it does, but the plainest farmer, or the mere school boy, if he reads it in Thomson's work, will perceive that it means, not as Dr. W. would have it, that all constitutions are equally strong, capable of enduring the same amount of fatigue, degree of exposure to disease, &c.; but that the organic structure, the mode of eating and digesting food, of performing the secretion, imbibing disease, and casting it off, &c.,



are the same. Let the Doctor disprove this if he can. It was neither the fever nor the "highly stimulating treatment," but some of the vile drugs that were combined with them by art, that destroyed, formerly, so many patients afflicted with the small pox; for the Thomsonians are still far more successful than their opponents, in the treatment of that disease.

Dr. W. says, "Cayenne enters largely into most of those famous numbers, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, as well as into almost every prescription." Here is another specimen of his accuracy in the statement of facts. "Strict veracity," says Dr. Francis, "is above all other things required in medical writings." Except the 3d preparataion, a compound rarely used, cayenne forms no part of No. 1.—Cayenne itself is No. 2; of course it does not "enter into" that No. Cayenne does not belong to Nos. 3, 4 or 5, as every one who has studied Thomson's books, even no longer than "a week, ought to know." Therefore, we have here five *fibs* to one truth; is not this "medical iniquity?"

Having thus puked up all the Thomsonian numbers at once, the Doctor feels relieved of the cephalic neurosis, [the tendency to delirium,] and commences an attack on Thomson for his "slander, foul abuse, and misrepresentations of the regular faculty and their system, his sentiments of atheism and blasphemy, his attack on the priesthood and religion, and foul reflection on the female character," &c. As to the slander and abuse of the regularly educated physicians, he has fallen far short of their slander and abuse of him, or of his followers, or even of one another. The severest sentence against physicians, to be found in his works, is the following quotation from the "amia-

ble, benevolent and pious Dr. Hervey:" "Can any one behold without scorn, such drones of physicians, and after the space of so many hundred years of experience and practice of their predecessors, *not one single medicine has been detected that has the least force, directly to prevent, to oppose and expel a continued fever?* Should any one, by more sedulous observation, pretend to make the least step towards the discovery of such remedies, their hatred and envy would swell against him, *as a legion of devils against virtue*; [severe enough,] *the whole society* will dart their malice at him, and torture him with *all the calumnies imaginable*, without sticking at *anything* that should destroy him, root and branch! [Is not this a harsh accusation?] For he who professes to be a reformer in the art of physic, must resolve to run the hazard of his reputation, life and estate."

Let Dr. Williams first pull the beam out of the eye of Dr. Hervey, for writing the above, before he undertakes to extract the mote out of Dr. Thomson's, for copying it and pointing to its fulfilment. So it has been—they have prosecuted and imprisoned Thomson, accused him and his followers of insanity, and of murder, in the highest degree, and declared that we are unworthy to live.

As to "the attack on the priesthood, religion and the female character," we can no more approve of it than Dr. Williams. We deeply regret that any general reflections bearing this character, should have been admitted into the work, and are happy to perceive that they have been omitted in the late editions. But we do not go to Dr. Thomson to learn religion, any more than we would to Dr. Williams, who tells us five fibs to one truth. We cannot approve of saying any thing derogato-

ry from the good name of *any man* or *class of men*, except to defend our own or that of others, against abuse previously heaped upon ourselves or them. But, if we reject all the medical works whose authors were tainted with "blasphemy, atheism, abuse of one another, or scandal against the priesthood and religion," there would not be medical reading enough left to prevent Dr. W.'s head from becoming "the Devil's workshop." So great was the tendency among medical students of the last century to become practical atheists, that the great Dr. Wm. Paley thought he could not be better employed, than in calling to his aid the evidences exhibited by the most minute anatomical observations, to prove the existence of divine wisdom and goodness in the construction, preservation and continuance of the material world.—Thomson's "sentiments of atheism," are nothing in comparison to the splendid schemes for "crushing the Christian religion in toto," which Dr. Paley had to encounter, and in which schemes, Dr. W. knows "regularly educated physicians" bore a full share.

The Doctor now gives us a peep at the "regular scientific system." He says it is a sort of treasury of all that is valuable in the experience of all who have discovered any thing respecting the human system, the nature and progress of disease, or the action of external agents, "no matter whether discovered and used by the ignorant, daring and desperate quack, or by the intelligent, cautious and conscientious physician, [of course it includes all that is good, and *excludes* all that is improper or dangerous in the Thomsonian quackery.] It has been and is still cultivated, by such men as Hippocrates, Galen, Hervey, Sydenham,

Cullen, Hunter, Bell, Broussais, Lænnec, Boudelocque, and our own immortal Rush and Physic," &c. &c. All this is very pretty oratory; let us see how well it will stand the test of facts and logical deductions. Though I delight to contemplate even the delicate flowers whose destinies are suspended on the mercy of the lingering frosts of spring, yet, I confess, I take *more* pleasure in regaling myself with the mature and mellow fruits of autumn's bounty.

If the scientific system possesses all the advantages of the Thomsonian, how comes it that so many cases, abandoned by the advocates of the former, are cured by the skill and means exercised by those of the latter? Dr. Eoff says, "for want of some such medicine, [as his quack nostrum,] *physicians* have not been able to cure one case in ten of *confirmed dyspepsia*." But I can give you more than twenty certificates of cures of this disease by the Botanic practice, after the patients had been pronounced incurable by regular physicians; and so far from doing more harm in general, than good in particular, the practitioner has never lost a case of dyspepsia yet. More comparisons presently. Was Hippocrates cultivating the science of medicine as it is now understood, when he cured the plague in Athens by sweating his patients with herbs, and stimulating them with the rich wines of Naxos? Did Galen sanction the poisoning system of our day, when he said, "Mercury is a poison, and *as such*, ought not to be given to cure disease?" Is Hervey to be praised for discovering the circulation of the blood, and Thomson abused for discovering what will not only "directly expel a continued fever," but cure almost every form of diseases to which the human frame is liable?

Must not Thomson even *quote* what Hervey dared to *write*? Dr. Waterhouse says that Dr. Thomson "is a reformer of the art of physic;" that "to him belongs the honor of introducing the invaluable lobelia inflata, alias 'Thomsonia emetica,' to the notice of the medical faculty." Sydenham was called by his cotemporaries a quack. Why is his authority more binding on the faculty at the present day, than Thomson's? Cullen, as I have said, performed 1600 fruitless experiments on one disease. This seems to be the authority and example most followed by *some* of the medical gentlemen of our day. When Hunter declared "the stomach to be the great centre of sympathies," he had only a distant view, through, as it were, a thick Indian summer mist, of the great, imperishable, and now clearly revealed, Thomsonian Doctrine, of the unity of disease. The idea of curing all diseases by cleansing the alvine canal and purifying the blood, recommended by so many eminent men, is not very favorable to the opponents of the unity system. Do Broussais, Lænnec and Boudelocque encourage the gluttonous calomel eating of the American school? Does even Dr. Williams justify the rejection of nosological arrangements by Dr. Rush, or approve of the atonic and entonic system of that good man, and more especially of the excessive phlebotomy to which, it is generally agreed, he fell a martyr? Do the dealers in blue pills for dyspepsia, fall on the semi-Thomsonian hickory ley prescriptions of the cautious, wise and prudent Dr. Physic?

We do not pretend nor desire to say, that medical men, generally, are not "devoted to the best interests, and studious to promote the happiness of mankind." We cheerfully grant it: but *their*

*good intentions* do not secure them, infallibly, against error. Dr. W. will find that he has presumed rather too much upon our ignorance, when he would induce us to believe that the opinions and practices of the great men whose names have just been mentioned, were all on the side of the ordinary theories of the schools, and the practices of the living profession, and opposed to the Thomsonian. Dr. Rush used to say he believed that the vegetable kingdom contained a remedy for every form of disease; and advised all his pupils to attempt the discovery of it. In his contempt for nosologies, he was not a whit behind Samuel Thomson. That all diseases are to be cured by the same remedy, does not mean that they are to be cured by the same single article, but by a single systematic process, viz: of relaxing the body, throwing off obstructions, and toning up the system. This may be done by any means that are calculated to effect it. Thousands of vegetables are adequate to the task, but the principle of application must ever be the same.

Dr. Williams would have us believe that "the scientific system includes all that is, or ever has been known of diseases" and their remedies.—How then is it that the Thomsonians cure a multitude of patients whose diseases the regular faculty neither understand nor can cure? We will give you as many certificates of this fact as you will publish, even to the filling of your year's Journal. He says, "The Thomsonian System is erroneously predicated and absurdly sustained."—Please Mr. Editor, publish the letter of your venerable and learned neighbor, Dr. Waterhouse, containing "*his opinion*" of these positions. You will find it in the number of the Recorder which I

send you. This will "tell him (Dr. W.) of a learned physician recommending this monstrous system to the world." If he wants more such evidence, he can find it in the letters of Dr. Montgomery, and Drs Hersey and Saunders who practised many years on the old plan, and were surgeons in the United States Army. Dr. Williams says, Thomsonism is "quackery." Dr. Waterhouse says, "if so, it is quackery of a most singular kind."

Dr. W. says, "all that he would ask is, that the Thomsonian System be placed in the hands of the public." This is just what, and *all that*, is desired by its most ardent friends. They have no fears of the result. It shuns not the light nor the severest scrutiny. But why then does he labor to throw the petition under the legislative table? The Doctor undertakes to ridicule Thomson's instructions in obstetrics, and alludes with a sneer to the declaration that it was chiefly derived from his own experience and the hints of an old woman, &c. This reminds me of the fact that, in youth I knew such a woman, (very properly called Roads, for she was always on the trot,) and yet never *heard* of her losing mother or child. Doctor A. I. Coffin, of Troy, New York, informs us that he has attended 200 cases of obstetrics, and lost neither woman nor child. [T. R. vol. 1, page 158.] Let a comparison be drawn between these statements, (they are but fair samples of what ordinarily occurs under the practice of Thomson and of skilful old women who have never aspired to ape the scientific,) and what he has observed of the regular practice, and he will be astonished at the superiority of the Botanic practice. There are, of my acquaintance, nearly twenty family vacancies that have occurred under the scientific obstetrics, and not a few more patients that are ruined for life.

Dr. Estes of Petersburg, Va. says he "cured 56 cases of scarlet fever and lost not one." The Thomsonians of Mechlenburg say they "had about 100 cases, and lost all but 99!" Messrs. Nash & Tatem "received into their Infirmary last year 600 patients, and lost only 10, though the great majority were of the most desperate character."—Can the medical faculty any where boast of such success? I have practised three years on almost all the diseases of our climate, and mostly on patients considered beyond the reach of medical aid, and yet, I have never lost a single patient to whom I had given any assurance that a cure could be effected—never one on whom I was the first, the continued, and the only physician in the case.—Though I practised on it during both its visits to our city, I never lost a single case of cholera, that I undertook to cure. Many were pulseless, and several were collapsed in their hands, arms, legs and feet. I have restored to comfortable health, more than twenty dyspeptics and rheumatics, whom physicians the most eminent could not cure. It is disagreeable thus to speak of one's own doings; but, when we do so, we know that we speak the truth. I can assure your correspondent, Dr. Gillespie, that the Botanic practice is the best ever devised for the cure of "inveterate dyspepsia and chronic aphthæ." I have cured many cases without fail in any. By the way, why these interrogatories, if the scientific practice prescribes the best course that ever was or now is known for the cure of those diseases? The truth is, physicians, like Noah's dove, have been flying about four thousand years, every now and then alighting upon some buoyant chip which soon sank, and left them dependent on their wings again. But



they have never, even yet, found a piece of solid earth (in the shape of a correct general theory and treatment of disease) on which to rest the sole of their foot. We cannot blame them for ill success in a chase in which they have pursued so diligently; but we do feel sorry to see so many good men wasting their energies to such a degree, in a mischievous practice, based upon erroneous principles. But, let me prove this assertion. Two ladies became dyspeptic. Being well fed with mercury, they grew worse, till they and their friends lost all expectation of their recovery. They tried the Botanic practice. When the heat was raised to the natural pitch, the mercury which, till then, had produced no other apparent effect than to deaden the energies of the patients, commenced "its specific action," swelled the limbs and produced large ulcers on the tongue, mouth and bowels, and a profuse salivation. One had an ulcer on the tongue, half an inch in depth and much larger in diameter. They were soon cured. If it was right to give the mercury, then it was wrong to drive it from the system. But the giving increased the power of the disease; while the disengagement of that and the cold and canker, cured the patient. Again, I have treated, as a friend, almost every form of fever in the nosological catalogues, especially the bilious, pleuritic, typhus, scarlet, &c. I have *aided* the fever *against* disease, and have not, in a constant practice of almost two years, lost a single case of it. If fever is an enemy to health, this course of pushing it to its extremity ought to have killed every patient. Instead of that, the fever was generally cured in two or three hours! A few, particularly of the eruptive class, have lingered a day or two, till the

morbid matter was expelled. "Fever must be an *enemy* to life," say the doctors, "for we can't cure it." It is a *friend*, say the Thomsonians, for, by our aid, it cures disease. Something more than Dr. Williams's say so, is necessary to convince us that we are wrong.

Mr. Editor,—I am aware that I have drawn largely upon your liberality, but Dr. W. as well as myself, is desirous that this subject should be exhibited to the people. Let it be done, and, if it cannot bear the strictest scrutiny—let it sink! Unless you request it, I shall not trouble you again; but, if you proffer me an occasional hearing, I will either ruin the Thomsonian cause forever, or prove, to the thinking and unprejudiced portion of the profession, that it is based upon imperishable truth.

Yours &c.

A. CURTIS.

NOTE.—If you publish, please don't alter or amend the text—(any comments you choose.) If you reject, please inclose this in a wrapper directed to me. I am a subscriber to your Journal—I take it of one who, though he does not feel able to pay for it, is unwilling that you should lose a subscriber.

A. C.

✂ The Editor returned the manuscript, and inserted in his Journal the following note:

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—To the writer of a voluminous article, signed A. C., we feel compelled to say that the subject of his paper is at war with the principles we labor to sustain. To elevate the

profession is a duty, and is the object of this Journal; but to give currency through its pages to doctrines which men of true science have invariably reprobated on account of their destructive tendency, would be inconsistent, impolitic and dishonest. While we acknowledge, therefore, our esteem and personal respect for the writer, whom we would willingly oblige in any way not incompatible with the best interests of society, we beg to decline the publication of the manuscript alluded to, from a conviction that it would only provoke controversy, and lessen the dignity of medical science. The manuscript will be returned.

✂ The controversy was provoked by the insertion of Dr. W.'s speech; and it is a universal custom among editors, as in courts of justice, to allow an accused (whether person or principle) at least one opportunity for defence. How Dr. Smith evaded the rule, especially after making the declarations at the head of this article, we are at a loss to determine. That it would lessen the dignity of medical science, was well judged. It has done so to a fearful extent. And it will still scatter to the winds, so long as it is read, all that false dignity that has been accumulating for ages and is still partially sustained by "medical manoeuvring," such as his refusal to allow the truth to dissipate the darkness of Dr. W.'s errors.

In the foregoing copy of Dr. Williams's address, are several paragraphs which were not in the Medical and Surgical Journal. On those we shall make a few remarks in an Appendix.—ED,

## CONTROVERSY IN NORTH CAROLINA.

In the summer of 1835, the following article appeared in the "Herald of the times," a weekly political and miscellaneous paper published in Elizabeth City, N. C.

MR. ALBERTSON: Please publish this for the benefit of others.

*"To do good and communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased."*

Were I to withhold from the public, as I am a public man, the benefit I have witnessed lately by resorting to the Thomsonian remedies, as it regards my own health, I should perhaps reject the claim of the above text; and, as many of my numerous acquaintances in different States, perhaps may be prejudiced against Doctor Thomson's theory and practice as I have been, much to their disadvantage as it regards health and comfort, I hasten to make the following statement:

In February, 1833, from taking violent cold, I was assailed by diarrhœa, dyspepsia, inflamed stomach, mouth and tongue, with soreness in the throat and rheumatism. The first course I pursued, as in former cases of affliction, was to consult our good physicians, and take different medicines at their discretion, none of which seemed to effect a cure. And I feel it my duty here to say that every attention was manifested by them that could be, and all this gratis, for which I feel the deepest gratitude, and an abiding sense of their goodness will ever cause me to revere them as my distinguished friends. They advised me to visit the Springs. This I did last summer, but all failed to give relief. I was frequently advised to try the

Thomsonian plan. This I refused to do feeling the strongest prejudice against it. I pronounced it quackery. I however declined taking common medicines, and resorted to simples, among which I made a bitter of Barberry root in the rye whiskey, which gave me some relief. But the symptoms again and again returned. At length my son, who was reduced to the margin of the grave the same summer by chill and fever, was again attacked last summer. He applied to Mr. William Allen, who took him through a course of Thomsonian practice, which in twelve hours effectually cured him, and he was able to attend to his school the next day. Soon after, Mr. Whittington, who married my daughter, was taken with a species of flux and violent vomiting, in which case there appeared to be much danger. He sent for Mr. Allen about midnight, who, by the very same course of medicine, restored him in twelve hours. Here are two different diseases cured at once by the same remedies. This astonished me and induced me to the same course myself; and, to the everlasting honor of Dr. Thomson, his course of practice applied by the same Mr. Allen, has, in the hand of God, perfectly restored me to the enjoyment of all the sweets of health that I ever enjoyed, except those feelings all men must naturally witness in the decline of life. Moreover I do affirm, that no medicine that I took, or operation I underwent, produced even the slightest degree of nausea on the stomach, or fainty feeling, except the vomit of lobelia, which made me a little sick for about fifteen minutes. I vomited but once, and that with less unpleasantness than in any emetic before. The offensive matter discharged was at least three pints in quantity, and astonishing in its appear-

ance. This was immediately after I had taken the steam bath; and I can truly say that I feel perfectly relieved from all my complaints. Thousands of prayers have been offered in my behalf, that my life might be preserved—that I might again visit the distant churches and regions of country as before; and I have cause and hope I do feel truly thankful to God for the restoration of my health.

R. T. DANIEL.

---

In a succeeding paper was inserted the following commentary :

#### REV. MR. DANIEL AND THOMSONISM.

MR. EDITOR: It too often happens that men commit errors and do wrong, with the very best intentions on their part, and that they who think they are called upon to communicate all they know, frequently communicate more than they know. In common with a great many others, we entertain the greatest respect for Dr. Daniel, as an upright, faithful and humble minister of the Gospel, and regret that he should compromise those feelings of honorable regard, by presenting himself before the public in any other capacity than that of the clerical. If a man is a good teacher and guide in religion, it does not follow therefore that he is a judge of medicine, and competent to instruct the world in every thing else. When such pretensions are advanced by clergymen, with many, it injures the holy cause of religion itself, by weakening the confidence they ought to have in its ministers. The world is always ready to censure

such conduct, because it is generally believed that the subject of religion is ample enough to occupy all the powers, and all the efforts of the most enterprising minds. Besides, we are not ambitious of the honor of having Elizabeth City made the central point for the diffusion of the absurd doctrines of Thomsonism, when it is certain that the good sense and intelligence of the community are decidedly opposed to them. 1.

On all subjects upon which we may desire information, we ought to go to those who are in possession of it, and never be misled by the prejudices and caprices of any individual whatever. Instead of heading his communication with a quotation from Scripture, had the Rev. Mr. Daniel commenced by acknowledging himself, as he is, a general agent and an interested party in the distribution of the Thomsonian Tracts, and the spreading of that system of practice, some suspicion might have attached to the motives and intentions which he had in view. We do not however attribute to him any mercenary designs, and in all that we are going to say, we would wish to premise that *truth* is our only object, and not personal opposition and crimination. We intend to speak not so much of Mr. Daniel and religion, as of Mr. Thomson and quackery, and doubt not that the latter gentleman is deserving of much harder blows than we shall be able to inflict upon him. 2.

If the reputation of the Thomsonian System is to be established upon the authority and recommendation of Mr. Daniel, we might observe that, for the three cases of successful treatment which he adduces, we could easily bring forward twice the number of unsuccessful ones, when the most decided injury was sustained by this practice.

What family nursery is there that cannot furnish instances of the successful application of domestic remedies? yet who would think of going to nurses and old women, to learn the principles and the rules of the science of medicine? 3.

In regard to Mr. Daniel's own case, which he describes as having commenced "with diarrhœa, dyspepsia, inflamed stomach, mouth and tongue, and with soreness of the throat and rheumatism;" he informs us that he applied for the attentions of regularly bred physicians, who were unable to give him any relief, notwithstanding he used their medicines. What views these physicians took of his case I know not. To me it appears to have been, though severe, yet very simple. He undoubtedly had inflammation of the stomach and bowels, which extended as far as the mouth and fauces, and had he confined himself patiently to a low diet, taken little or no medicine, resorted to mucilaginous drinks, and had a few cups of leeches applied occasionally to the abdomen, he would unquestionably have been well in a very short time. After taking various medicines however, he goes to the springs, and still finding himself not recovered, he resorts, after the lapse of several months, to the Thomsonian remedies, when the acute inflammation of his disease had time to subside. Had he have used them at first, he would have endangered the life which he is so thankful has been preserved. We do not wish to be understood as condemning the course of practice which the physicians recommended to Mr. Daniel. We are not told what it was. Perhaps it was correct, but only required time and perseverance to accomplish its object, especially as the inflammation to be removed, was very extensive, and also, since diseases in elderly



persons, are much more obstinate than they are in youth. 4.

Of what use can communications like that of the Rev. Mr. Daniel be to the public? Consult the current papers of the day, and see how many certificates they contain, exalting this system of practice, and recommending this and that popular remedy. At one time the highest authority is enlisted in behalf of electricity; at another, in favor of steaming, Indian physick, the botanical and hygeian practice. All these methods are regarded by some as infallible, while others invite our attention to balsams, panaceas and catholicons. 5.

"What tempting lures attract us as we pass;  
Pills, powders, plasters, galvanism, gas."

Some are opposed to mineral substances, and trust to simples, while others deem that there is perfect safety in roots and vegetables, and Mr. Daniel announces to the world his confidence in pepper and steam. 6.

How these short-sighted theorists and innovators crowd upon each other; and who cannot discover, in their different creeds, either the proofs of a misguided judgment, or the calculations of self-interest, or that universal proneness to speculate upon the foibles and imbecilities of human nature, or, what is worse, that culpable desire and thirst after worldly influence, and the passionate ambition of placing ourselves at the head of some set of opinions and doctrines. 7.

Amidst all these conflicting opinions and this host of remedies, it is the business and the duty of the intelligent physician, to select the materials of a regular system. He commences by investigating the constitution of man; by determining the nature and properties of medicines, and ascer-

taining the nature of their action upon the human system, and in every thing that he does, he is, or ought to be guided by correct and established principles. Would it be new to Mr. Daniel, to be told that there are no remedies as such, in the world, and that medicines must be given from their known properties and effects? They are employed as auxiliaries, and not because they of themselves are able to accomplish cures. 8.

Medicine, like religion, has advanced its way in the world, through opposition and error; and like religion, also, it has been and will be sustained by the principles of truth inherent in it. It is established upon this basis, and would not be the less true, if a myriad of men were to disbelieve it.—When Judge Marshall was requested to give his opinion upon the subject of phrenology, as he was acquainted with that study, he simply replied by saying “I have not examined it.” But hundreds are ready to judge and decide questions of medicine, without any knowledge and without any examination. They hold up their little rush lights in the face of the sun, and ask the world to look and see how brightly they burn. They know the name of one little star, and think they understand every constellation in the heavens. They have skill enough to draught an almanack, and believe therefore, that they are most expert and learned astronomers. Such men remind me of Seneca’s wife, of whom it is said, that, being afflicted with blindness, she thought that she could see perfectly well, but that every body else was blind. 9.

It is safer to trust entirely to nature in any disease, than to confide in quackery. Who is not acquainted with deplorable instances of mal-practice in the hands of incompetent persons? But

how unimportant are a few individual cases, compared with what takes place on a larger scale, and in a wider sphere! The most frightful mortality among the human species, at the present day, is to be found in those parts of the world where the profession of medicine is neglected or unknown, or where some such system as that of Thomsonism prevails. There are so many things which are given in medicine, that no skill is required *in giving*; all the skill and penetration are shown, *in not giving*, or in withholding every thing that is improper. That there are some things which are proper, is not to be doubted; but they are so because they are applicable, and their suitability depends upon the correct principles in applying them. For instance, if a man is sick, especially with an inflammatory disease, we would not think of giving him tincture of myrrh, or red pepper, or any such Thomsonian medicine. We would recommend on the contrary, what would be calculated to reduce and remove, not aggravate the inflammation. 10.

“It is believed by many persons competent to express an opinion, that the science of medicine has done and is now doing more to meliorate the condition of man, than all the other sciences put together. It keeps constantly in view, the most laudable and praiseworthy objects, the prevention and the cure of diseases, the principles and the prolongation of human life. Returns were made last year from St. George’s Hospital, London, contrasting the results obtained from practice, among the same number of patients and the same descriptions of diseases, for the last fifty years and more. They prove that the mortality has been diminished more than one hundred per cent. in

consequence of the improvements introduced in the methods of treatment. The same results can be shown from the hospital registers kept in this country. 11.

With these palpable truths before us, and in full view of every one, how it may be asked is there so much empiricism in the world? To this we reply, that it is produced partly by the abuses of medicine in the hands of incompetent physicians; partly by the avarice, indolence and cupidity of man, and his instability in pursuing occupations with which he is acquainted; but that it is chiefly encouraged and fostered by that spirit of delusion and credulity, found wherever the human family exists. Though man is naturally prone to error, yet we believe that he is fond of truth, and that nothing is more acceptable to his mind. 12.

Let us contrast for a moment, the science of medicine with the crudities of empiricism. Medicine takes a philosophical view of man and his diseases; empiricism looks upon medicine as a mystery, and diseases as something that must be expelled violently from the body. Medicine treasures up facts, quackery overthrows them. The one moves in light, the other gropes in darkness. Medicine is the daughter of reason and philosophy; charlatanism, is the offspring of credulity and superstition. The former is built upon principles and established by observation; the latter is opposed to all principles, and even denies those that common sense would admit. 13.

The Thomsonians object to the use of the lancet, the indications of the pulse, and the necessity of any depletion whatever. In cases of congestion or fullness, or violent inflammation of some vital organ, how many persons have been indebted

for their lives, to timely and judicious depletion.— That this depletion however, must be used with care and judgement, as well as all other things, must be admitted. Empirics succeed not by the merits of their own views, but by exciting prejudices against the more enlightend views of others. When you attack them, they hide themselves under the cover of these prejudices, and are like a certain description of fish, which, when pursued, eject a dark substance from their bodies, and effect their escape in the muddy and discolored waters. Who envies the position which the quack holds in society? What honorable mind would covet the gains of imposture, or pursue an employment which thrives upon the weaknesses and errors of his fellow-man? “I’d rather be a toad and live upon the vapours of a dungeon.” 14.

Is there any thing connected with Thomsonism, which looks like a system, or is entitled to that name? They denounce cupping, leeching, blistering and all depletion, often so indispensable in practice, and depend upon a few emetics, stimulants and diaphoretics, and all these of the most kind in those large and extensive classes of medicines. Those that they use, the properties of which they so imperfectly comprehend, are all employed by the regular physician, as well as a great many others, according to emergencies. Is he a competent mechanic, who knows how to use only a few tools of his trade, and is ignorant of all the rest which are of daily service? Can any one transact any kind of business, when he is unacquainted with all its rules and regulations? It is not the name or title which makes the physician, it is knowledge, preparation, application, judgment. Whoever practises medicine, and is destitute of

these things, whether invested with a diploma or not, is a most dangerous and pernicious member of the community, one whom every one ought to dread, and whom all should avoid. 15.

O, presumption! what a foe art thou to humility and knowledge. How many men, says the adage, had been wise, had they not thought themselves so already. I could suggest to the reverend gentleman, that, to be distrustful of ourselves and to be lowly minded, is not less essential in wisdom, than it is grace. 16.

We must have teachers in medicine, as well as in religion, and there are times when we need the best counsels of both. He has never perhaps witnessed a severe and protracted case of illness, where there were a number of violent and conflicting symptoms, which required the utmost skill to attend to, and where every thing connected with Thomsonism, would only add torment to torment, and be throwing oil upon the fire. 17.

Who is ignorant of the fact, that the science of medicine is a standard and criterion of the state of knowledge in any community? It keeps a regular march with the course of human improvement, and is found in the greatest perfection where there is the greatest degree of cultivation and intelligence. The profession of medicine, makes itself entitled to the respect and gratitude of mankind, by the countless benefits which it endeavors to confer upon the human race. It strives to conquer and remove those numerous diseases which are the heavy penalties of our existence, and which so much interfere with our enterprise, our enjoyments, our usefulness, and with all the noblest designs and pursuits of life. 18.

It is the business of medicine to point out the ra-

tional rules of living; it searches for appropriate remedies; it discovers antidotes to poisons; it encourages the pursuit and investigation of all the physical sciences; it fosters education; and, by the establishment of medical jurisprudence, it secures the ends of justice in the world. 19.

Signal as all these distinguished benefits are, who thinks of bestowing honor and eclat upon what is daily accomplished in the usual course of practice; while the least achievement of quackery, the mere blunder of ignorance and the accident of experiment, is emblazoned to all the corners of the earth, with the renown of a miracle. 20.

Opinions on any subject ought never to be formed from an imperfect knowledge of it. Such opinions are always to be distrusted, and are almost always wrong. They occasion confusion and misunderstanding, and are the sole cause of so much error and contention in the world. What absurdity is there, for instance, in disbelieving in the practice of medicine, as a regular system, and crediting that which is an obscure and imperfect part of that system? How preposterous is it, to reject that which is the most clear and intelligent, and to receive in its stead, that which is the most monstrous and absurd? For Thomsonism is the most absurd of all systems ever yet devised by the ingenuity or stupidity of man. I would no sooner believe in it, than I would in Boodhism or Juggernaut. 21.

Thomsonism requires no preparation, it exacts no qualifications. "There's magic in the web of of it." A little book and a little money to buy it, initiates you at once into its mysteries, and unlocks to you the whole temple of medicine!

And who is its presiding deity? Why a Mr. Thomson, a man greater than the greatest hero of the Dunciad. Behold him enveloped in steam, and stuffed with pepper, lobelia, and myrrh!—So easy and rapid is this installation and metamorphosis, that some of our acquaintances, who have hitherto been following respectable, but humble occupations, are in an instant converted into doctors, much to their own surprise, and more to that of every one else. Were we to enumerate not only the men, but the women too, who have thus been suddenly transfigured into medical rabbi, by this marvelous system, it would excite our greatest laughter. 22.

But the subject is too serious for laughter, too grave for ridicule. The greatest men who have adorned the profession of medicine, and who have shed around it the lustre of their talents; who have devoted their lives to the establishment of its principles, and to the conferring of its benefits upon the world; these men it seems have all been laboring under error and delusion, and must yield place to a man by the name of Thomson, who has made the wonderful discovery, that an emetic and a vapor bath are infallible remedies for all diseases. 23.

What tyro in medicine does not know, that if you give an emetic, and excite copious perspiration in a consumptive patient, that you will endanger his life; and that if this practice is persevered in, you will certainly produce his death, and that too in a very short time? Have we recently witnessed no such cases as this among us; and must they pass not only without the expression of our sorrow and surprise, but without exciting the deepest pub-



lic indignation? And is this the system, which must be trumpeted to the world, and to establish which, our ministers of the Gospel must descend from the sacred desk, and indite an epistle general, not to the seven churches, but to several whole states, in order to promulgate its virtues and its truth? "Shame where is thy blush?" reason where is thy apprehension? If we heard such things told of a foreign people, who would not think them incredible? 24.

There are a few other things, Mr. Editor, which I had wished to notice in Mr. Daniel's communication which the limits of a newspaper will not permit. I had desired to show, that those medicines which are used by regular practitioners, have been proved by experience, not only to be proper and useful, but the most proper and useful. Among these are included many chemical and scientific preparations, such as Quinine, Morphia, as well as a variety of tinctures and extracts, which cannot be dispensed with. 25.

How easy would it be to expose the fallacy of confiding entirely to vegetable medicines, which are generally thought to be entirely harmless?—The most active poisons are obtained from the vegetable kingdom; and the vegetable stimulants are the most permanent in their effects, and likely to prove the most injurious. When the vegetable and alcoholic stimulants and astringents are united, they ought to be used with care and caution. The '*Barbary root*' and whiskey, therefore, which the old gentleman drank during his sickness, was highly improper and injurious, and if he wishes "to do good and communicate," he ought

not to publish such prescriptions to his brethren.  
26.

One thing further only, can we notice in Mr. Daniel's letter. Who would fail to remark the covert blandishment, with which he speaks of those "good physicians," who attended him in his illness and that too without any compensation?—In the name of those "good physicians" also styled his "distinguished friends," I will inform the reverend Divine, that every honorable man would disdain to be kissed on the cheek by an enemy in disguise. 27.

How much more had Mr. Daniel recommended himself to our approbation and esteem, had he made a communication, really useful in its character and tendency; and, had he advised those pretended doctors of his acquaintance, to exercise more modesty and discretion, and not to thrust themselves into a profession which they do not understand, and cannot practice with utility!—Can medicine, which requires the greatest application and reflection, of all studies, be comprehended without any application and reflection at all? I could suggest to those Thomsonian physicians, the propriety and necessity of reading a few elementary works on anatomy, pathology and physiology. But, 28.

'Parts like half sentences confound, the whole, conveys the truth.'

If they decline, therefore, perusing any of these productions, I hope they will at least, allow me the liberty of recommending to their notice, a little poem written many years ago by Burns, entitled "Death and Dr. Hornbook." 29.

**MEDICUS.**

To the foregoing commentary, a writer over the signature of "BOTANIST," sent to the Editor of the Herald, the following reply:

MR. EDITOR:—In your Herald of the 17th inst. I perceive an article headed, "Rev. Mr. Daniel and Thomsonism," in which the author who signs his piece "Medicus," labors through 29 paragraphs, to show the evils which he fears may result from Mr. Daniel's imprudence, in sending, for a former number of your paper, two paragraphs containing a statement of a few simple facts. If, after 15 paragraphs to 1, "Medicus" finds "the limits of a newspaper" too narrow to receive all the notice he could "wish" to bestow on "Mr. D's communication," [par. 25] he will surely excuse me for not noticing, in an equal space, all the minutiae of his 29, especially when he knows that nine-tenths of all he has said is nothing to the purpose—mere dust thrown into the eyes of the reader to prevent him from discovering the truth.

Medicus has noticed in his communication many things that might be turned with great force against himself; but, as truth is our object, we will endeavor to take no advantage. His object appears to be to establish the following points: "That the Rev. Mr. Daniel has stepped out of his proper sphere." [See pars. 1 and 2.] Answer. If Mr. Daniel was out of his sphere in "recommending" the "pepper and steam," would he not have been equally so, in "advising those pretended doctors of his acquaintance not to thrust themselves into a profession which they do not understand," &c., [see par. 28] which "Medicus" would have approved? But, query. *Did* the Rev. gentleman step out of his sphere in the case? Let us see.—What is his business? To "go about doing good."

Now suppose, in his travels, he should have inadvertently been led into a scene of danger, from which an act of Providence alone rescued him. Is he stepping out of his place when he warns same his friend whom he sees running into the danger, against thus risking his life and usefulness? But I need not suppose. May he not warn the young man against running the same race that has led the drunkard to ruin and the grave? Is he to see the cause of physical education languish as it does, and not open his head about the matter, for fear that the rum-seller and the pedagogue may call him to order?

"That the Rev. Gentleman has undertaken to teach others what he himself does not know."—With all due deference to the finer optics of Medicus, I am unable to perceive that Mr. D. undertakes to teach any thing, unless it be that his disease was called by certain names, for which he has the authority of the medici who attended him—of course he was correct in that. The fact is, the gentleman did not attempt any didactics; he only stated a few simple facts with which he was well acquainted, and left others to reason and learn for themselves.

Medicus says, [par. 3.] "we could easily bring forward twice as many cases (six for three) where the most decided injury was sustained by this practice." Here, we are at issue with the Doctor. Let the number of patients treated by any two practitioners of the different schools, (say himself and Dr. Allen or Dr. Wm. Elliott) with the symptoms, circumstances and success, be carefully compared, and if it be not found that the new practice has greatly the advantage, I have no doubt that the general apprehension of the fact will be amply sufficient

to deprive "Elizabeth City of the honor of being the central point for the diffusion of the absurd principles of Thomsonism." We need not tell Medicus that *such* comparisons of the actual matters of fact that come under our own observation, are making every day more Thomsonians than all the theories and marvelous certificates that were ever printed.

"That the treatment that had been successful in the chronic stage of Mr. Daniel's disease, would have been fatal in the acute."—[par. 4.] That may be, but we prefer, as the basis of our faith, our actual success in almost every case, both acute and chronic, to *any* theory of the medici on the subject, however plausible.

That "communications like that of Mr. Daniel," will be of no "use to the public." We answer, they will induce others to "go and do likewise," and thus afford Medicus six more "fatal examples" to oppose to the other "three that may be successful;" and so bring the career of these "absurd doctrines" and this destructive practice the sooner to a close! True, Medicus says that this system comprises some of the "conflicting opinions and host of remedies" out of which "it is the business and the duty of the intelligent physician to select the materials of a regular system," (of quackery of course, for the whole must partake of the defects of all the parts, every one of which, in turn, has just been condemned by Medicus.) [See pars. 5, 6, 7.] "He commences," says Medicus, "by investigating the constitution of man; by determining the nature and properties of medicines, and ascertaining the nature of their action upon the human system; and in every thing that he does, he is or ought to be, guided by correct and established

principles." [See par. 8.] Yes; for the most part the Doctor is right in this last assertion; and we have only to determine whether Dr. Thomson and his followers, or they that have gone before him, or they that now despise him, have done this. Let us examine. Dr. Abercrombie of Edinburg says, "The difficulties and sources of uncertainty which meet us at every stage of such 'investigations,' are in fact so numerous and great, that those who have had the most extensive opportunities of observation, will be the first to acknowledge that our pretended experience must, in general, sink into analogy, and our analogy too often into conjecture."—[*Am. Lib. No. XXXVII. page 299.*] Has any other M. D. discovered more "correct" and "better established principles," as to the "nature and properties of medicines?"—Those most used by the schoolmen are poisonous, and better calculated to kill than to cure. [See the two charts of Toxicology at the end of "The Physician's Pocket Synopsis."] Of "the nature of their action on the human system," the same author says: "their action is fraught with the highest degree of uncertainty." [Page 295.] How then can any be "guided" in their use "by correct and established principles?" See the articles, Hydrargyrum, Hyoscyamus, &c. in the U. S. Dispensatory, where it is said of the first, "Of the *modus operandi* of mercury we [physicians] know nothing," &c. And of the second, "*If* the virtues of Hyoscyamus, do, in fact, reside in any one principle, it is highly desirable that this should be isolated, as we might thus obtain a certain, instead of a *highly uncertain* remedy. [Page 350.] But the time and the paper would fail us to be particular. This uncertainty does not accompany the

administration of the Thomsonian remedies; for Dr. Barton says, "the United States do not produce a plant of more unequivocal action on the human body," than Lobelia. [Med. Bot.] The Edinburgh Dispensatory says that "cayenne is the purest stimulant known." The Boston Medical and Surgical Journal says, that "no single article can surpass it for stopping hemorrhage." The Russians, Turks, Persians and Italians, consider steam the balm of health, and all doctors agree, as much as in any one thing, that perspiration is the best of all cures for fevers, and that all they *know* of the Thomsonian tonics are good for debility; while they acknowledge that all their most active medicines are poisonous! That it requires uncommon knowledge and skill to prevent them from killing the patients to whom they are administered.

"That Thomsonians judge the science of medicine without examining it." [Par. 9.] No, we do not. We contend that a tree is known by its fruits. We look at the design of medicine, viz: to heal the sick. But we find that many of the sick, instead of being healed by "the scientific practice of medicine," falsely so called, are suffered to die; and that an alarming number of those who escape death, are left to "linger out a miserable existence," under the deadly influence of those poisonous drugs that had been scientifically administered to them to cure disease. This we well know, because we find that when, in the exercise of our regular profession, we drive those drugs from the system, we restore to the patient a comfortable measure of health; thus discovering what Dr. Rush found out by dissections, the "awful destruction of human life that had been made, under the cov-

er of false theories, respecting the animal economy, and the action of external agents upon its various organs!" A vast proportion of all the patients attended by Thomsonians, have tried "the scientific practice" without relief. Fully believing that the faculty would, if they could, we are compelled to believe they *cannot* relieve us; and that therefore their system if (they have any) is defective and injurious. I myself have seen a great number of patients cured by Thomsonians, of whom regular physicians had said, "they cannot live." If doctors would cure all their patients, they may rely on it, no man would risk his reputation and estate, by becoming or even employing a Thomsonian.

Medicus says, [par. 10,] "It is safer to trust entirely to nature in any disease, than to confide in quackery." So say we: but what is quackery? It is pretence to know and do what one neither knows nor can do. Who then were the quacks in the case of Mr. Daniel and others? We profess to know what are scarlet fever, measles and cholera. We have treated many cases, especially of the latter, without a single failure in any. Can Medicus say as much for his practice? He says, "the most frightful mortality among the human species at the present day, is to be found in those parts of the world where the profession of medicine is neglected or unknown; or where some such system as that of Thomson prevails." Surely the Doctor must have had in his eye the ill-fated town of Maysville, where, on the approach of the Cholera, in 1832, "the profession of Medicine," cast behind them their 250 grains of calomel, took to their heels, "neglected" the place, and left Thomsonism to "prevail" over the disease without a



rival! "We," says Medicus, "would not think of giving a tincture of myrrh or red pepper to a man sick of an inflammatory disease." No; and that is the reason why you suffer so many to die of inflammation. But Thomsonians think of it and *do* it; and thus often cure the patients whom the medici cannot. One of this description, now at my elbow, has been nearly cured in three weeks, of a disease that had baffled the antiphlogistic treatment for as many years.

Medicus asks [in par. 12,] "Why empiricism exists?" We answer again, because the regulars do not cure disease. See our answer to par. 9. Paragraph 13 contains an excellent description of science and of quackery. Compare it with the effects of the regular and of the Botanic practice, and one will easily see to which system and practice each term and description applies. "How many persons," says Medicus, [par. 14,] "have been indebted for their lives to timely and judicious depletion?" Possibly one, while a hundred have been injured, if not ruined by it. See Professor D. L. Terry on this subject.—T. R., vol. 3, p. 385.

Medicus labors to convince us, that the Thomsonian "emetics, stimulants and diaphoretics, the most kind" of their class, are only a few tools selected out of the vast chest of the M. Ds. which they alone know how to use with discretion.—What then is the reason of the notorious fact, that with all their tools and skill, they so often destroy or mar the beauty of the building; while, with the few, "the kindest of their class," the most clumsy Thomsonian almost universally repairs and beautifies it? We agree with Medicus that "it is not the name or title, but knowledge, application and judgment that make the physician," and we repeat

that, with all the display of learning, the M. Ds. exhibit; the people will soon judge who possess these, *by the effects of their practice*. [Par. 15. 21.] We rejoice as much as Medicus that "truth is great and will prevail."

"How many men, says the adage, had been wise, had they not thought themselves so already."— [Par. 15.] Medicus is evidently one of these, for he says, [par. 21] "presumptuously" (his whole communication showing that he knows nothing about it,) that "Thomsonism is the most absurd of all systems ever devised by the ingenuity or stupidity of man;" and adds, "I would no sooner believe in it, than I would in Buddhism or Juggernaut." Here, reader, is a specimen of that enlargement of mind, that openness to conviction, that love of truth and desire to bow to it wherever found, that respect to the opinions of others, and that hesitancy of premature decision, which are all indicated by the term "liberal," as applied to mind, heart or education. I despair of enlightening such a mind.

"We must have teachers in medicine," &c.— So we must, and *we* prefer those teachers *who prove by their success*, that they teach the truth. [Par. 17.]

"The science of medicine keeps a regular march with the course of human improvement," &c.— Yes, says Lord Bacon, "in a circle, but not in progression." Theories spring up, are widely disseminated, receive the sacrifices of hecatombs, and then retire like the waves of the ocean to be succeeded by others of like character, effects and destiny! [Par. 18.]

"Thomsonism requires no preparation—no qualifications." [Par. 22.] Here Medicus thinks he

has a wondrous argument against us. Does he forget that Thomson spent forty years in *preparing* this system; and that he *requires* his followers to make themselves well acquainted with the important truths he has gathered from such a series of observations and experiments? Of what use would it be to them to know what *he has proved* to be worthless? Of what use *would* it be to Medicus, to know the rise, ravages and destruction, of those systems of the schools that have been exploded,\* *if he had* found, at last, a mode of arresting disease sufficiently sure and safe to deter him from similar experiments? Hobbes, disgusted with useless details, "wished all the books in the world could be embarked in one ship, and he be permitted to bore a hole in its bottom." "Locke thought that, "before the hole was bored, some literary analysts should select all the facts, recipes and prescriptions useful to man, and condense them into a *portable volume!*" [Locke abridged.] This is just what Thomson has done in his "New Guide," so far as they relate to medicine, and "the volume" may be committed to memory in a very short time. Experience proves that a strict adherence to it, will make a better practical physician, than a minute acquaintance with all the folios that the learned have ever written on the subject. "All the skill necessary in the case," says Thomson, "is to know what medicine is wanted and how to administer it." The patient knows that he is sick—Thomson directs him to remedies friendly to health, and at war with every form of disease. The administrator's task is easily learned and speedily executed. Yet Medicus would induce us to believe that, because a knowledge and skill seldom

---

\*See Good's Nosology, Preliminary Dissertation.

attained are necessary to teach us how to make one poison counteract another without killing the patient, [Par. 19,] the same are necessary to enable us to expel all poisons whatsoever from the system.

The unfairness of Medicus is still further obvious, in his attempt to induce the public to believe [par. 24,] that Thomsonians kill all the patients that die under their hands of the consumption, with "emetics and sudorifics, which," he says, "produce death;" whereas, the Editors of the Physician's Pocket Synopsis, say [page 512,] that "emetics may here be used with great propriety." May we not decide when doctors *disagree*? Also, in his insinuation [par. 26] that Thomsonians suppose all vegetables to be harmless, when he well knows that such is not their opinion of his opium, cicuta, hyoscyamus, and a thousand others. He says, [par. 15,] "Thomsonians denounce depletion often indispensable in practice." If it is "indispensable in practice," how comes it that they cure *without* this savage practice, almost every case similar to those in which the medici consider it indispensable, and of which they loose so large a portion. In a practice of two years, we have not lost a single case of congestion or of inflammatory diathesis; and yet we have never depleted.

But the time and space are failing me—suffice it to say that Medicus is evidently a genuine son of Æsculapius. He is so much accustomed to poring over errors and contradictions, that they have become a part of his nature; he cannot even write an article for a newspaper, without them. In par. 1st, he condemns Mr. Daniel for going out of the line of his duty in recommending the Botanic practice: yet he tells us, [par. 28,] if Mr. D. had con-

demned, instead of recommending Thomsonism, he should have approved of the deed. He censures Mr. D. for teaching others *any* thing but divinity, and in the same paper undertakes to teach him and the public a little of almost *every* thing but the art of curing disease! He hints [par. 2,] that Mr. D. may have been actuated by interested motives, when he had just finished the preceding by an acknowledgement that *such* were *his own*! He says, opinions should never be formed from imperfect knowledge, then states what is not true, and therefore must have arisen from "imperfect knowledge," that Thomsonism is "an imperfect part" of the regular practice, stupidly "absurd" in itself, yet being an ingredient of that *whole* which is "clear and intelligent," [intelligible.] All this confusion and contradiction and more, in the same (21st) paragraph!

He rails at the narrow-mindedness, illiberality and prejudices of others, and yet says of himself, "I would no sooner believe in it [Thomsonism] than I would in Boodhism or Juggernaut!"—[ism!]  
Really the gentleman needs a Thomsonian course or so, to regulate his nervous system.

If, in this hasty notice of his communication, he should suppose that I have overlooked any topics of importance, he will please to point out the defects and they shall receive all due respect from his most obedient servant.

BOTANIST.

---

The following is the rejoinder of Medicus.

FOR THE HERALD OF THE TIMES.

MR. EDITOR: A letter appeared several weeks ago in the Herald, with the signature of Rev. Mr.

Daniel, recommending the Thomsonian practice. It gave rise to not a little discussion; and, as many persons were disposed to censure Mr. Daniel, it is proper to state that that letter was published without his authority, he merely having parted with it, to one of his friends, expecting that it would only be perused in private. Those who are acquainted with Mr. Daniel, and know how sincere and exemplary he is in all things, and who appreciate his remarkable modesty and sensibility, regretted the unpleasant situation in which he was placed. Mr. Daniel never was an authorized, but only a voluntary agent for the distribution of the Thomsonian Tracts, and this self-assumed agency he has now thought proper to relinquish. It would be well, if others would imitate this laudable example and manifest the same regard to reason and propriety. 1.

It is somewhat strange, that while the improvement in knowledge is always progressive, and the amount of intelligence in the world is constantly accumulating, there should be so many behind the age in which they live, and that they should believe in doctrines which are congenial only with the darkest and rudest times. Science thus keeps in advance of mankind, and, like the pillar of the cloud before the camp of Israel, it is light to some and darkness to others. 2.

The East and West, says Lord Bacon; have no established points in the heavens, but the North and South are fixed. So it is with mankind; one half are wrong and the other half right. Truth is constantly at war with error, and will never dispel it from the world, as long as the prejudices and the interested passions of mankind are as strong and perverted as they are. Many persons would

rather adopt a weak argument in favor of their own views, than be convinced by a strong one against them. 3.

It is curious to see what delusions and superstitions have at all times been connected with the practice of medicine. In remote ages, calamitous epidemics were supposed to proceed from the anger of the gods; and sacrifices, even human sacrifices, were resorted to in times of Paganism, as propitiatory offerings, while processions and other religious observances were used in the Christian Church. (Blane's Med. Log.) Charms, exorcisms, amulets, magic and sorcery, and numberless fantastic preparations from bats, dogs, moles, snakes, worms, animals and various parts of the human body, as well as roots, vegetables, pepper and steam have at various times been looked upon as undoubted remedies for diseases. In the time of Geo. II. tar water was all the rage in England. Sir Horace Walpole relates an anecdote of a lady going to an apothecary, and asking him if he sold tar-water? His reply was, "we dont sell any thing else, madam." 4.

New systems and new doctors rise up and fall down, and soon sink into that great receptacle of oblivion prepared for all such things. These new systems, as well as most or all new patent medicines are brought into notice by the mystery and novelty connected with them, and die as soon as those feelings are satisfied, or are no longer excited. It is said that nostrums and panaceas never sustain a reputation beyond the life time of their inventors. Ward's various remedies went entirely out of vogue the moment they were published which was done after his death, by an injunction in his last will. (Sir Gil. Blane.) Who does not

recollect the anecdote of the shrewd quack in Paris, who bottled up the water out of the river Seine, and sold it as a valuable medicine, and with it too accomplished astonishing cures? All these remedies, however, and all other doctrines must give place to the Thomsonians, whose system, a wonderful writer under the name of "Botanist," says, its founder, Dr. Thomson, was 40 years in preparing. He might have drawn it up in forty minutes or forty seconds, for Botanist searches into the materia medica, and quotes authority for the virtues of lobelia and pepper; and afterwards tells us that the Persians, Italians, Russians and other nations, as every one knows, have from time immemorial been in the habit of using various kinds of baths. 5.

What then is there new in Thomsonism? If there is nothing new, there is at least something remarkable. For it is remarkable that so many doctors of that sect, should spring up and flourish for two or three weeks or months and then disappear, and become burrowed in retreats where it is difficult to find them. 6.

Botanist relates a story about *all the doctors* flying from Maysville before the cholera, and leaving the place unfortunately in possession of the Thomsonians. It is a small village, and perhaps the regular physician, at the time he alluded to, was called away to see a patient, or to attend to some other business. The Thomsonians then, who had never been heard of or employed before, had an opportunity of doing something. The circumstance reminds us of an anecdote which occurred during the convention for framing the new and present Constitution for the State of New York. It was proposed in case of the Governor's death, that the Lieutenant Governor should succeed, and



if he should die too, that the President of the Senate should officiate. A member from Schoharie rose up and said, "But, Mr. President, suppose the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, and the President of the Senate all should die, what shall we do?" "Why, Mr. President," replied another speaker, "when all the people in the State are dead, we can choose the gentleman from Schoharie to be Governor." 7.

It would certainly be better to raise than to lower the standard of medical qualifications, and that is the very object which professional and scientific men aim at, and the purpose for which medical schools and colleges are established. With all these wise precautions, however, the medical profession is still liable to abuse, and gets into the hands of improper persons. The argument, therefore, that a quack who uses only two or three things, is as good or better than a regular but incompetent physician, who uses more and with more mischief, does not amount to any thing.—We look upon both these characters as dangerous, and not fit to be trusted. It is safer to do without a physician, than to have any such. In the medical profession, no matter how great the natural abilities of an individual may be, he cannot dispense with those attainments which are acquired only by study and application. 8.

The greatest physicians have generally been very able and learned men, and their knowledge and skill were acquired before they obtained their reputation. But the Thomsonians reverse all this; they become doctors first, which they do in the course of a few hours, and then pick up a little scholarship afterwards. To get this they go to the works of scientific medical men, and affect to abuse

the very authors and persons who assist them in enlightening their minds. It is amusing to see "Botanist" quoting medical authorities, like Satan quoting Scripture. He opens a medical book and reads that emetics are good in consumption, without enquiring in what stage of the disease. They might be useful in the first stage, where there was a disordered stomach, but in the last stages of that malady, they would be highly improper and fatal. Cullen remarked long ago, that there were more false facts than false theories in medicine; but the theories that are predicated upon false principles must be doubly fallacious. 9.

To choose out of the whole list of articles in the *materia medica*, two or three only, and depend upon these entirely, to the exclusion of all others, which are often useful and necessary, would be as judicious and rational, as to adopt two or three commandments of the decalogue, and reject all the rest, or to credit the Apocrypha alone, and discard the Old and New Testaments. 10.

It is said that when the Indian Chief called the Turtle, had an interview with Kosciusko, in Philadelphia, at the close of the last century, the Polish general related to him the wrongs of his country and the tyranny of the Empress Catharine. The Indian warrior replied, after the General had finished, "Let that woman take care of herself"—"this may yet be a dangerous man." So we say of him who is disposed to try the Thomsonian practice, "let that man take care of himself"—"this is a dangerous system." For the Thomsonsians, it is said, do not adapt their practice to the constitutions of the patients, but the constitutions of the patients must be adapted to the practice; if not, they will sink under it. 11.

The Thomsonian doctors imagine that what they do, cannot be done by others. We have already observed that there is nothing new in their prescriptions. The regular physician or any one else, can give them if required. The physician has all these resources and many others besides in cases of emergency. The Thomsonian practice is no more to be compared to the established system of medicine, than common cyphering is to the system of astronomy, or a pigeon roost is to a palace. It is no doubt got up to bring certain people into ridicule, who will undoubtedly resent it, when they discover the trick. 12.

A wager was laid in England some years ago, that nothing, however ridiculous and absurd, could be proposed, but that the multitude would believe in it. An advertisement was accordingly issued that a gentleman on a certain evening at the theatre, would introduce himself into a quart bottle. A throng of people assembled to witness the extraordinary feat. But when the time came, the performer excused himself by declaring that he could not find a bottle which held exactly a quart. We live now in matter-of-fact-times and the world is getting too shrewd to be hoaxed. Mankind will never give their confidence to any thing that is not consistent and stable, and capable of being tested by experience and truth. We recommend to the astonishing steam "Botanist" instead of counting the paragraphs of a communication, to enumerate and reflect upon some of the arguments. 13.

MEDICUS.

---

The following second reply of Botanist, closed the controversy with "Medicus."

M. EDITOR: I have just received your 38th No. by which I am happy to perceive that your correspondent 'Medicus,' lately so severely "steamed and puked," has "got about again," with at least "the breath of life in him."

Not seeing, in the second production of Medicus, any attempt either to defend the positions taken in his first, or to give me the trouble to defend mine, I feel at liberty to take, in this number, any course I please. In order, however, to deprive him of a single "refuge of lies" against the Botanic Practice, I shall follow him as before, and "cut off his head with his own sword." It is often said of Thomsonian patients, that, "if they had taken one more course, it would have killed them;" but I shall run the risk of completely murdering the Doctor, by giving him this second, notwithstanding the former produced the most distressing prostration of his intellect, as his late effusion clearly proves. The relaxing effects of lobelia are truly wonderful!

In paragraph 1st, Medicus says, Mr. Daniel's "letter was published without his authority, he merely having parted with it to one of his friends, expecting that it would only be perused in private." Now I should believe this statement, had I not good reason to doubt it. In the first place, I have the testimony of Medicus himself, in the 24th paragraph of his former piece, that Mr. Daniel "indited this epistle general, not to the seven churches, but to several whole States." Now, of these contradictory statements from the same gentleman, I am left to determine, in the best way I can, which is correct. I therefore refer, 1st, to Mr. Daniel himself, who says, in his introductory paragraph;—"Were I to withhold from the public,

[not a few private friends!] the benefit I have lately witnessed by resorting to the Thomsonian remedies, I should perhaps reject the claim of the text [“To do good and communicate, forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased,”] and, as many of my numerous acquaintances *in different States*, perhaps may be prejudiced against Dr. Thomson’s theory and practice, as I have been, much to their disadvantage as it regards health and comfort, I hasten to make the following statement.” Will any one believe, after perusing the above introduction, that the sequel was intended only to “be perused in private?” It must be, for the scientific Dr. Medicus says so, and we must not oppose our ignorance to his vast erudition—the reflected ray of a bubble to the glory of the sunbeams! To account further for the discrepancy of the two testimonies of Dr. Medicus, above quoted, let us see if he is capable of committing errors in any other statements. In par. 2d, No. 1, he stated that Mr. Daniel “is a general agent, and an interested party in the distribution of Thomsonian tracts, and the spreading of that system of practice.”—In par. 1st No. 2, he says, “Mr. Daniel *never was* an authorized, but only a voluntary agent for the distribution of the Thomsonian tracts, [of course he was not paid and “interested”] and this self-assumed agency *he has now thought proper to relinquish*. Am I any more certain that this last assertion is correct, than I am of the correctness of any other assertion of Dr. Medicus? Again, he says, par. 5th, that I “search into the materia medica, and quote authorities for the virtues of lobelia, pepper,” and “various kinds of baths;” thereby intimating that Thomsonians depend on, or are indebted to that authority for their knowl-

edge of those virtues, when he well knows my sole object in quoting those authorities, was, to "judge out of his own mouth," the "regular" slanderer of these invaluable remedies. For ourselves, we cannot place the least dependence on what the M. D's say of any of these articles—our every day's experience proving that those gentlemen are almost totally ignorant of their virtues. He says, (par. 9th,) that "Thomsonians become doctors first, and then, to pick up a little scholarship, go to the works of scientific, medical men, and affect to abuse the very authors and persons who assist them in enlightening their minds;" whereas he knows that all the use Thomsonians make of medical authors, is to get weapons for self-defence.—To his intimation that this is the course I pursued, I just reply, that the reverse was the case. Having wandered in the mazes of medical uncertainty, till, with Dr. Brown, I found myself "in the situation of a traveler in an unknown country, who, after losing every trace of his way, wanders in the shades of night," without star or compass, [Rob. p. 55.] glad indeed was I, to find, in the Thomsonian system, some sure landmarks to guide my weary steps, after a toil so long and fruitless, in search after them. Imagine my mortification on the discovery of almost the only truth I found, that both the theories of disease and the action of external agents on the body, either in causing or arresting it, "are fraught with the highest degree of uncertainty." (Dr. Abercrombie.) In par. 10th, Medicus says, "Thomsonians depend only on two or three articles of the *materia medica*, to the exclusion of all others." Now, if Medicus knows any thing about the Thomsonian System, he knows that Dr. Thomson recommends, in his works, the

use of more than seventy different articles; and has given a rule for finding, when these are not to be had, substitutes to an unlimited number.—Of course he wilfully misrepresents. If he does not know the truth of the matter, then I see not with what sort of grace he could so highly commend, in No. 1, par. 9, Judge Marshall for refusing “to give an opinion on the subject of Phrenology,” for the *trifling reason* that “he had not examined it.” Medicus laughs at my assertion that all “the doctors fled from Maysville before the cholera;” and says, “It is a small village and ~~perhaps~~ the regular physician, at the time he alluded to, was called away to see a patient, or attend to *some other business!*” when the Thomsonsians who had never been heard of or employed before, had an opportunity of doing something!” I do not pretend to know how large the village is, but Dr. Nathan Hixon of the place, a gentleman of intelligence and respectability which none will question, informs us that it contained “eight or ten physicians,” (T. R. vol. 1, p. 428,) and yet that “he had nearly three-fourths of all the practice in cholera, scarlet fever, &c.” As to the “OTHER BUSINESS” to which the doctors were attending, the Editor of the Louisville Price Current informs us, by a letter which he says “was written by a *highly respectable* PHYSICIAN of Maysville!” This letter says, “all that have been taken have died. Almost every body has left the city—~~all~~ the doctors are gone!” ~~Why?~~ “We [doctors] have no inducement to stay! We cannot control the disease!” But I am tired of following the gentleman through his misrepresentations. Enough has been done to prove that even his statements of facts are not to be relied upon. Of course his

general principles must be well examined before they be received as logical deductions.

In par. 3d, Medicus says, "one half of the world are wrong, and the other half right." I dispute this position, and defy any man to prove that more than one man in a hundred thinks for himself, or comes to the knowledge of the truth by selecting the correct thoughts of others. Humiliating as the confession is, experience, even in this most highly favored country, bears us out in the declaration that "men, in the aggregate, are incapable of governing themselves according to the dictates of their own best interests." Ninety-nine out of a hundred, at the smallest ratio, depend on the priest or minister for their religious creed, on the lawyer for their jurisprudence, and on the doctor for the safety of their bodies—disprove it who can. Let me not be understood to advocate an absolute government. Badly as the people rule themselves, I contend that no one else has a right to rule them. Medicus intimates that the people will not always be hoaxed—true, but their fault and misfortune is, that they are ever prone when they shake off one hoax, to take up another. See his 4th and 5th paragraphs.

In par. 6, Medicus insinuates that many, after having practised awhile, abandon the Thomsonian system, as unworthy of their confidence. It is true that some practise awhile and then quit it; but it is because they never intended to do more of that business than to satisfy themselves and their neighbors of its excellence. Others quit, because of the opposition that is raised against their persons, property, and employments on that account; not feeling it their duty to suffer their own ruin for the benefit of others. "For," says



Dr. Hervey, "he who professess to be a reformer in the art of physic, must resolve to run the hazard of his reputation, life and estate." In par. 24, No. 1, Medicus says, "If you give an emetic and excite copious perspiration in a consumptive patient, you will endanger his life;" and that "if you persevere you will certainly produce his death in a very short time." But, after I had proved, from medical authors whom he dared not dispute, that emetics are good in this disease, he changes his tune and says they are good in the first stages. The gentleman takes as many tacks as a yankee smack among the West Indian Islands.

In par. 12th, Medicus says, "the Thomsonian Doctors imagine that what they do, cannot be done by others." We do not *imagine any thing about it*. We know, that *many* things we do, *are* not done by others, for Dr. Eoff says that "for want of medicine [like the Thomsonian] that will cleanse the stomach and intestines, of all offensive and irritating matter, without debilitating them, *physicians* have not been able to perform a cure *in one case out of ten* of confirmed dyspepsia," &c. See his advertisement of pills, in the papers. Every Thomsonian's experience tells him, that he can cure nine cases in ten. I have cured more than twenty cases of this disease on which the doctors had practised for years in vain, *and I have never lost one yet*. The same may be said of rheumatism, and a host of other forms of disease. If, as Medicus says, the faculty *could* have cured these, the reason why they *did* not, is because they *would* not. Choose of the dilemma which horn you please—Charity inclines my choice to the former.

Finally, instead of destroying the Botanic, and

sustaining the "regular practice," Medicus gives us a sketch, par. 4th, of the vast advantages to be derived by the physician, from an acquaintance with the delusions and superstitions that have at all times been connected with the practice of medicine," interspersing the whole with—not arguments to prove, but—*anecdotes* to illustrate his views of the subject. His whole essay is just about as applicable to the subject in question, as Dr. Syndtchen's learned disquisitions were, to the cure of neighbor Wymbly's knee and ankle. See Thomsonian Recorder, vol. 2, page 206-7-8.—(Please re-publish for the amusement of your readers.) And the manner in which he quits the field, reminds me of the conduct of Sawney, who, having long contemplated with a covetous eye, the plentiful harvest of his neighbor Jemmy's field, finally having broken a hole in the hawthorn hedge, was about entering the premises with the full expectation of returning unmolested, and laden with the spoils—when lo! the voice of Jemmy saluted his ears, "hoot, mun Sawney, wheer ar ye gangin'!" "Bock agen, Jemmy," was the laconic reply!

BOTANIST.

P. S.—Having written every line in the spirit of candor and liberality, I will thank any man who shall point out my errors, and show me the truth. Only convince me that any or all the Thomsonian remedies *are capable* of producing, even in the most unskilful hands, a hundredth part of the mischiefs that daily result from the "scientific" use of mercurial alone, and I will discard them forever. Medicus often speaks very correctly about "quacks," "science," "matter of fact times," "ignorance," "prejudice," &c. But when I ask

him to *prove* what he *intimates*, that the quackery, ignorance and prejudice are all on the side of Thomsonians, he finds it more convenient to entertain me with anecdotes than what I desired, viz: a comparison between his practice and that of his Thomsonian neighbors. Why does he who professes to be so fond of "matters of fact" in medicine, content himself with displaying "the delusions and superstitions that have at all times been connected with the practice?" [See his 4th par.] He says, par. 11th, "This is a dangerous system," and he fathers the slander that "Thomsonians do not adapt their practice to the constitutions of the patients, but those constitutions to their practice." Now, we challenge him and all his brethren to *prove* that there is one word of "matter of fact" in the above assertions, and we assure him that, whenever he shall make any thing like a decent attempt at it, we will prove, to the great advantage of "this system," and the no small consternation of its opponents, that the "matters of fact" are the very reverse; and, so far from indulging any personal ill feeling towards any gentleman who differs from us in opinion, we would be glad of a free interchange of views, with Medicus or any one else, in a social conversation. We shall be governed by truth and facts—not indeed "false facts," such as those which inform us of the introduction of "charms, exorcisms, amulets, magic and sorcery" to medical practice; but those which prove the superiority of one medicine and system over another; for, by "false facts"—things impossible in the abstract—I suppose Medicus means those which have no connection with, or bearing on, the points to be proved. See those he has adduced, for example.

BOTANIST.

After the appearance of the preceding, Medicus either quit the field, or changed his signature. (A correspondent in Elizabeth City says; "It is pretty generally believed here, that Medicus wrote the piece signed Omar.") At all events the next we saw of the controversy was the following.

FOR THE HERALD OF THE TIMES.

MR. EDITOR: By giving the following piece an insertion into the columns of your much admired and useful paper, you will very much oblige

*A subscriber from the country.*

In the great and important discoveries which modern observation and experiment have led to, it is the generally received opinion that the people of the present day are possessed of much more knowledge than the moderns of the two or three last centuries, or their ancient predecessors. And although among those who think thus, may be reckoned most of the original and clear-sighted geniuses of our time; yet there are not wanting some, and those too, men of talent and high respectability in the literary world, who are accustomed to think, if the ancients knew not quite so much as ourselves, yet their works contain the great outlines and leading hints of all those discoveries and improvements which the degenerate moderns have, with great arrogance and presumption, held forth to the world as original.

Had these enthusiastic admirers of antiquity stopped at declaring the Iliad of Homer and the Æneid of Virgil the best possible of poems; and the Philipics of Demosthenes and the Orations of Tully, the most finished of oratorical productions, I should not at this time have given myself the

trouble of contradicting the extravagant and unwarrantable assertions to which their literary superstition has led them. But when they declare that in matters of science as well as of letters, the ancients arrived at a degree of eminence altogether superior to that which the moderns have attained, that the vast labors and researches of modern philosophers have added nothing to the improvement of science, I confess that I am disposed to believe that they have founded their assertions neither upon the firm basis of truth nor of observation.

To refute these absurd and ill grounded notions, it is only necessary briefly to call your attention to the science of medicine, which has, within these few years, been brought to such a degree of perfection by the exertions of one individual alone, as to surpass any thing ever before accomplished or even dreamt of by the boldest and most daring reformer of any science. Indeed, I do not hesitate to affirm (and I believe you will most readily concur with me,) that what Newton did for natural philosophy, Buffon for natural history, Locke for ideology, Lavoisier, Priestly, Black, and Davy, for chemistry; all this and more than this, has the *immortal*, I had almost said *divine*, Thomson done for medicine!

Physicians of the old school were obliged to spend four or five years in the most assiduous study before they commenced the practice of their profession; but the science has been so completely simplified, and so thoroughly purged of its superfluous parts, that is, of Anatomy, Physiology, *Materia Medica*, Pathology etc. etc., by the above named illustrious reformer, that a few hours or at least a few days are now sufficient to initiate the the most illiterate or humble candidate into all

the arcana of medicine! Nothing, forsooth, is more common than to see *things* strut forth to-day armed with a portable bath and a budget of roots, declaring themselves capable of curing the "thousand ills to which flesh is heir," who would yesterday have run to their grannies for some *means* to cure a *belly ache*, as they would have termed it.

Who, then of all the philanthropists, that have adorned human nature and been an honor to their countries, shall, on the day of final doom, dare to claim precedence of the REDOUTABLE THOMSON, the modern conqueror of physicians? Come forth, ye admirers of Howard, and all those philanthropists who have spent their lives and fortunes in ameliorating the condition of their fellow men, come forth! and to give our *hero* his just meed of praise! Let his brow be encircled with a wreath of lobelia and wake robin, let his path be sprinkled with pepper, and when the Almighty Disposer of human events shall have summoned him hence to enjoy the society of his congenial spirits, the modest and retiring Thesalus, and ever-glorious Paracelsus, then let the incense of myrrh continually smoke upon his altars!!

OMAR.

---

FOR THE HERALD OF THE TIMES.

MR. EDITOR: As many persons are not disposed to listen to arguments and reasoning upon the subject of Thomsonism, you will oblige some of your readers by publishing the enclosed statement of *facts*. Perhaps they may be of benefit to some,

and may teach that boasting writer 'Botanist,' who has sometimes appeared in your columns, to exercise a little more judgment and humility.

ONE OF YOUR SUBSCRIBERS.

FROM THE PENNSYLVANIA INQUIRER.

*Death by Quackery.*—The following statement is published on the authority of a highly respectable physician of Kensington.

A gentleman of the highest esteem, by the name of Jackson, from one of the upper counties of New York, having closed the business which called him to Philadelphia, was induced, on the day previous to his intended departure for home, to apply to one of the Thomsonians, on account of a slight rheumatic affection in one of his legs, being otherwise in perfect health. He was accordingly placed (from his account) under the usual course of steaming and high stimulation, for several hours, and when in the greatest degree of perspiration and excitement, was suddenly drenched with cold water, which induced a violent secession of blood from the surface, upon the vital organs, attended with excruciating headache, oppression, prostration and vertigo.—In this *condition* he was sent away, and with the utmost difficulty reached his lodgings in Kensington. His throat, stomach, and perhaps bowels, were literally scalded by the quantities of cayenne and lobelia (a rank poison) which he had swallowed during and after steaming; requiring constant draughts of cold water and sugar to allay the violent thirst and burning. He became worse and grew delirious, stupid, convulsed and apoplectic, and died in a few days with evident symptoms of effusion on the brain, in spite of the efforts of two

medical men of experience, and the most assiduous kindness of his friends. The speedy removal of his body to his family, after death, precluded an opportunity of examining it.

This is the second case of the kind that has occurred to one of the attending physicians in the above case, within a few weeks in the northern part of the city.

---

To the foregoing, Botanist sent the following reply.

FOR THE HERALD OF THE TIMES.

MR: EDITOR: I have just been amusing myself with looking over the efforts of the "small fry," that have volunteered their services in aid of the redoubtable Dr. Medicus. At first, I thought I would not notice them; but, perhaps it may be as well to record a few of the reflections which their efforts have suggested.

Though it may be said of "Omar" as of one of old, "howbeit he meaneth not so," yet, abating a little for his enthusiasm, he has scarcely exceeded the sober truth. He may confidently affirm that, "What Newton did for Natural Philosophy, Buffon for Natural History, Locke for Metaphysics, Lavoisier, Priestly, Black, Davy" and others, for Chemistry, all this and more, the immortal Thomson [though I doubt not his name will be remembered with veneration, while the art of healing shall continue a special object of human attention, yet I cannot join Omar in calling Dr. Thomson "divine,"] has accomplished for medicine. Do not startle at the assertion that he has done MORE!



Those men improved on what had been partly done before, or at most corrected certain errors; whereas, he completely revolutionized the whole science.

As to their motives, I leave men to speak for themselves. I believe that Thomson's theory and practice of medicine will do more good to mankind, than all the improvements in arts, sciences, civilization and metaphysics, introduced by all the famous men that "Omar" has mentioned, put together; though no man values the improvements or the remembrance of these great men more than I do. Have a little patience, reader, before you pronounce me quite mad. Those men reformed, improved and cultivated sciences and arts which are only *convenient* and *agreeable* to man—not indispensable to his happiness. But health, conferred by the means and modes that Samuel Thomson has devised, is that without which every other blessing is wholly beyond our enjoyment. I was many years afflicted with dyspepsia, which completely prostrated the best energies of both mind and body.

A thorough study of the best treatises that the faculty had written on the subject, ["Physicians," says Dr. Eoff, an eminent gentleman of that profession, "have not been able to cure one case in ten of confirmed dyspepsia,"] left me with little to expect but a morbid existence while I lived, and a speedy departure to a place where the sciences (especially the boasted science of medicine,) are of little account. I knew indeed, that there were such things; I delighted in their contemplation, and their application to the prosperity and advancement of social happiness. But the want of health to enjoy the blessings they are capable

of conferring, made them, to me, like loaves of bread to the tenant of the gibbet. "I know you are 'good,' 'good,'" said the drunken Indian to his fast emptying bottle which had just fallen over the fence, "but I cannot save you." I knew that, in themselves, the sciences were 'good, good,' but every attempt *of mine* to derive pleasure from their contemplation, only increased the "pain in my head," and mental aberrations, and added to my misery. But the discovery of Thomson, like the blessing asked by Solomon, brought along with it, not in its forehead, but in *its train*, the ability to enjoy the distinguished blessings those great and good men had conferred on the world.

"Omar" insinuates that the Botanic System renders useless the study of Theories of Medicine, Anatomy, Physiology, Materia Medica, Pathology, &c. Thomsonians do not tell him so. They reject only the parts that have been a thousand times proved to be wrong, or useless if right, of what has been written and taught of these branches, and require their followers to learn the simple, common sense view of them, which enables us far to surpass, in the cure of disease, the great professors of those branches of medical science. We cannot believe them so necessary to the physician, as "Omar" would have us to suppose, while it so often happens (without any jest) that a person who, yesterday, was taking calomel, opium, nitre, &c., with much the same faith, feeling and profit as that with which the votary of Juggernaut pays religious homage to the wheel that is about to crush him, finds his eyes thrown wide open to day, by the simple application of a Thomsonian course.

The placing of Thomson and Paracelsus side by side in another world, as "kindred spirits," exhi-

bits both the profound learning and the discriminating "judgment" of "Omar" in a most enviable light. Just look at the fitness of such an association! "Paracelsus introduced mercury, antimony and opium into the materia medica; but he was arrogant, vain and profligate; he lived a vagabond and died a confirmed sot. He studied mystery, and wrapped up his knowledge in terms of his own invention, so as to keep it confined to himself and a few chosen followers. The very reverse of Thomson, who performs numberless cures and makes no secret of the means. The cant phrase of *Quack*, belongs to the learned Paracelsus, but not to the mystery-hating Thomson, who considers mystery and roguery offsprings of the same man of sin, the "father of lies and deception." [B. Waterhouse, M. D., Th. Recorder, vol. 3d, page 154.] Let us hear these two kindred spirits salute each other, as the latter passes the former to his higher seat, as Omar would have it, in the mansions of the blessed.

PAR. Good morning Dr. Thomson; I long enjoyed the happiness of seeing that my name has been handed down to posterity with great veneration, in consequence of my introducing mercury, opium antimony, &c., into medical practice, and shrouding the whole art of healing in mystery, by the use of "terms of my own invention." But now I am *overjoyed* to see the man who has exposed all my "pride, arrogance" and false renown, disclosed to the gaze of the world, in its true colors, my system of poisoning, "deception and mystery," and caused a large portion of the dwellers upon earth, to regard me as the contriver of a system of medical practice, which has destroyed more lives and human happiness than the sword, pestilence and famine &c. &c.

TH.—Nor can *I* be less delighted to see the man whose system had well nigh destroyed the life no less than five times, of some one of the beloved inmates and members of my family, for my exposure of which system, its advocates and friends have used every means in their power to ‘destroy me, root and branch’—to deprive me of my reputation, estate, and even life itself. I say, having risked every thing dear to human nature, to liberate my fellow creatures from the thralldom of one of the most oppressive bondages under which they labor, that which you spent your ingenuity and “roguery” to impose upon them, it must be a source of the greatest happiness to us both to enjoy together the blessings laid up in these delightful regions for all such kindred spirits! “Ever glorious Paracelsus” “who lived a vagabond and died a sot!” a fit companion for Thomson, who has spent a long life in healing the sick, and warring against intemperance! Surely those illuminati, who have cast such a halo of “glory” around us, poor Thomsonians, must either suppose that we are too ignorant to detect their arrogant assurance, or they are themselves the very ignorant and presumptuous beings whom they would persuade the public that we are. Thus much for “Omar.”

Next comes “a death by Quackery,” among other objects, “to teach that boasted writer, Botanist, to exercise a little more judgment and humility.” Well, then, “*judging*” from the facts, 1st, that the highly respectable physician of Kensington, did not choose to sustain the tale by the “authority” of his name; 2nd, that he details what he *did* not see, and of course *could* not know, viz: “that Mr. Jackson had a *slight* rheumatic affection

in one of his legs, *being otherwise in perfect health*;" 3d, "that the blood from the surface violently seceded upon the vital organs; 4th, "that his throat and stomach were literally scalded, [an effect that *never could be produced* by swallowing a bushel of each,] by the quantities of cayenne and lobelia, (a rank poison,) which he had swallowed during and after steaming;" 5th, "that he died with *evident* effusion on the brain," [the Doctor did not see that organ;] and 6th, that I have never seen nor heard of such a series of sufferings and of such a death under the Thomsonian treatment; I should "*humbly*" conceive that this tale were false, from beginning to end—but, when it is added—"in spite of the efforts of two medical men of experience," my mind is entirely relieved. Two medical men of experience have often been *doubly* sufficient, with their depletion, freezing, sedatives and starving, to make a poor Thomsonian patient "delirious, stupid, convulsed and apoplectic," and even to—let him die! Inasmuch as these dreadful symptoms did not occur till after the commencement of the "efforts of two medical men of experience," (by which time the terrible heat and excitement produced by the "steam, cayenne and lobelia," were doubtless abated,) how do those gentlemen (or their representative "subscriber") know that the whole suffering and death were not produced by these *medical* "efforts," instead of those of the Thomsonian? Is not the fact that the Thomsonian used simple decoctions of innocent herbs, whose *direct* effects, good or bad, pass away in twenty-four hours at most, and that the Doctors, (if they went according to the directions of the mineral schools,) used the rankest poisons, strong circumstantial evidence that the

latter was the case? Calomel that had been taken *twenty years* before, produced, in a woman in one of the hospitals of Paris, a *salivation* that destroyed the patient "in spite of the efforts of" all the "medical men of experience" in that great nucleus of medical knowledge. A thorough steaming &c. of one of my patients, lately produced a salivation and ulcers that made holes in the mouth and tongue, some of them large enough to introduce the end of your finger, and continued many weeks, though she had taken no mercury for more than twelve months! After these effects ceased, they could not be renewed by the use of ten times the quantity of steam, lobelia, cayenne, &c., by which, let it be remembered, not the "literal scalding," but the *rotting* and *fetor* of the alimentary canal, was purified and healed. I have had patients that had taken so much opium that the moment the "steam, cayenne and lobelia" roused it into action, they would be so "stupid" and "delirious" as to make it very difficult to rouse them, and get them to take more medicine. These are rather puzzling facts, if the Pennsylvanian's faith be correct.—Again, I have put so many patients into a *very great*, if not "the highest degree of perspiration and excitement, and then suddenly drenched them with cold water" without *ever once* producing the least secession of blood from the surface upon the vital organs, (any other way than as it should be,) with sensible and permanent relief *from* "prostration, oppression," &c., that I cannot believe the tale in question, till my own head "turns round." I doubt not those doctors may have seen many such deaths as they describe—their system is calculated to produce them—But I do doubt if any one of those deaths occurred under the continued practice of a Thomsonian.

REFLECTIONS.—What a wonderful article this “poison” lobelia must be! In the Columbia S. C. Herald, of August 12, 1834, we are told that it poisoned to death the Rev. Mr. Gray, “without [producing] a single groan or struggle, or the least evidence of pain or distress in his features.” But we learn that, in Pennsylvania, it produced “delirium, stupor, convulsions and apoplexy.”

The non-descript of a “subscriber” to the Pa. Enquirer, calls lobelia “a rank poison.” When he can make me believe that I have been often poisoned to death instead of being speedily relieved of disease, by taking a *full half ounce of the bruised seeds*, then (and probably not till then) shall I believe that LOBELIA INFLATA is *poison*.—When he can make me prefer twelve grains of calomel to twenty of cayenne for a cold, “*perhaps*” he will make me fear that the latter will “literally scald my throat, stomach and bowels.” When he can make me prefer going to bed dirty, and absorbing disease, to taking a seat in the steam bath, raising the heat high and then enjoying “the luxury” of a cold shower bath, that is, of being suddenly drenched with cold water,” then (and probably not till then) will he convince me that there is seriously a good foundation for the tale he has related.

When I hear Doctors speak of “effusion on the brain,” and “scalding of the stomach,” and other similar things which they can neither see nor know, and find those who pin their faith on the opinions of others, taking all these assertions for law and gospel; it reminds me of a silly girl, crying over the tragical death of a couple of lovers, that took place in a cave where *none but themselves* beheld it; a *minute* description of *all the circum-*

*stances attending which, she had just now perused in—a novel.*

### BOTANIST.

What a stupid race of fellows you Carolina Thomsonians are, to suppose that Dr. Medicus has suppressed or destroyed his pamphlets? He is only waiting to get “the whole controversy,” that he may show how skilfully he has “taken the farmer’s ox by the horns.” What! publish a couple of rifle shots without showing the turkeys he has killed? That be far from so shrewd a man as Dr. Medicus. Please ask him to send me one of his pamphlets.

### BOTANIST.

We understand that Omar made some sort of reply to this, but we could never obtain it. The postscript was added, in consequence of the reception of information that Medidus had published his first essay in pamphlet form; but had suppressed, if not destroyed it. The same letter says, The Thomsonian practice has increased more than double, in consequence of these discussions.

---

In the progress of the discussion between Medicus and Botanist, appeared an excellent article from another hand. As the points it discussed are all noted by Botanist, we extract only the following:

“It is true, as “Medicus” observes, that the science of medicine, at a very early period, became entangled with the absurd doctrines of supernatural agencies, incantations, charms, amulets, &c. But I would ask if it is not equally true that



it has been more or less shrouded in mystery down to the present age? and is it not a fact, that when these superstitious disguises were laid aside, others were assumed scarcely less calculated to operate upon the credulity of mankind? It cannot be denied. And even at the present moment, the science is disfigured by strange and frequently unmeaning technicalities too numerous and foreign to be perfectly understood by any but the most profound in medical learning. And thus it was truly remarked by a late eminent writer, that the system of medicine "finds its security in the darkness in which it is surrounded." Individuals have, at different times, appeared upon the medical arena, who were not only willing but competent to strip the science of its abstruse incumbrances, and exhibit it to the world in all its simplicity. But, in every instance, their honest and laudable efforts in behalf of the people, called down upon them the vengeance of the craft. This was peculiarly the case with Buchan, Culpepper and others.

The many deceptions (of which "Medicus" names a few) which for ages have been practised upon the people, under the specious cover of remedies, have excited in their minds a high degree of veneration for the medical character; hence it ceases to be a matter of surprise that all innovations upon the science of medicine should be met by the firm and united opposition, not only of the medical faculty, but of the public; and we are free to confess that the only thing which excites our wonder and astonishment is, that, in defiance of the violence of its persecution, the course of the Thomsonian practice is still rapidly onward. How is this to be accounted for? Why is it that in this

enlightened age, in these "matter of fact times in which we live," the people should suffer themselves to be thus "hoaxed" by these ignorant pretenders, as they are called, who profess to cure disease without ever having been taught in the schools? Why the fact is just this; having discovered the proper remedies, they cure not only all curable diseases, but often those that are said to be incurable; and when the people see and experience these things, they are compelled to believe.

We cannot help admiring the recommendation of Medicus to the Steam Botanist, to reflect upon arguments instead of counting paragraphs. No doubt he would be glad if Botanist would reflect more and write less. Don't be frightened Doctor, perhaps he may not kill you, even though he should carry you through a regular course. Be encouraged; you have a great deal to hope from the manner in which your last communication was received by the public; two or three more as replete with sound argument, may convince the world, for aught you know, that there is as much efficacy in the "water of the river Seine," as there is in steam, pepper, and lobelia.

AGRICOLA.

---

## LECTURES DELIVERED IN BALTIMORE.

Agreeably to a resolution of the Third United States Botanic Convention, Dr. A. Curtis, then of Richmond, Va., now of Columbus, Ohio, delivered, October 16, 1834, to that Convention and the citizens of Baltimore, the following

## LECTURE,

*On the origin, the nature, the progressive improvement, and the perfection of Reason; with illustrations of its popular application, in remarks on the Botanic System of Medicine.*

Looking upon this vast and enlightened assembly, I almost tremble at the thought that I am about to occupy an hour of your precious time.—Yet I am in some degree relieved of the awful responsibility, when I reflect that, though I may not conduct your attention in the best manner through its details, I shall propose for your own contemplation, a *subject* which yields to few if any others, in its claims to your regard—a subject which you may follow up at your leisure, and about which any mistakes or errors into which I may fall, may serve as beacons to guard *your* surer and safer passage through the ocean of thought which it opens to your view.

Survey with the strictest scrutiny, all the vast variety of human actions; ask every agent why he conducts thus or so, and, though many will acknowledge that their actions are wrong in the abstract, yet, all the circumstances considered, every one will tell you he has reasons sufficient to justify his course. So of their thoughts. All strenuously maintain that their peculiar opinions are based upon the most substantial reasons. Nothing is more universally claimed than reason. Each supposes his own to be, if not a perfect guide, at least the very best he can obtain, to conduct him to the right or wrong of human motives, words and actions. He looks to it for instruction in every case of difficulty, and, supposing it to be an inherent

and almost infallible test, condemns, as unreasonable and absurd, every thing that does not seem to tally with its dictates. Yet we find that different persons give different reasons for the same faith or action. One's reason approves of what another's condemns. It is very probable that there will be different opinions, in this assembly, about many of the positions and arguments in the sequel of this address. What some of my auditors will approve, others will condemn; and each will say he has reason for his decision, while the positions and arguments will be the same to all.

*All* reasons are, therefore, not *right* reasons.—Of course the *faculty* termed reason, is not inherent and infallible.

Still, as every person's faith and conduct are based upon what he calls his reason, and, of course, right or wrong according to the character of this regulator; it is all-important to ascertain what is *right* reason, and how far it is capable of guiding us in our search after truth.

This inquiry will lead us to contemplate its ORIGIN, ITS NATURE, ITS PROGRESSIVE IMPROVEMENT and its PERFECTION. First, then—

## ITS ORIGIN AND NATURE.

Many have supposed that it is a principle, like the mind itself, innate, implanted in the head by the Author of our being, and intended by him as our best and safest guide to the rectitude of human faith and conduct, especially in regard to the doctrines and duties of morality and religion. To refute this supposition, we need only give the accepted definition of the *term*, and forbear even an allusion to the almost infinite variety of opinions

that prevail in relation to those doctrines and duties.

"Reason," says Barclay, "is a faculty in man, whereby he is distinguished from beasts, consisting in deducing one proposition from another, or in finding out such intermediate ideas, as may connect two distant ones."

But what is a proposition? It is an assertion or a denial.

What is an idea? "The form under which any thing appears to the mind"—the image of the object contemplated. Now, assertions or denials must have respect to the existence, nature, form, and use of external objects, or internal sensations. But, until a human being has actually examined, by means of some one or more of the senses, the nature and relations of external objects, no *idea* or form of those objects can be stamped upon the mind. Of course, there can be no "finding out such intermediate ideas as may connect two distant ones." There is, therefore, no such innate principle or faculty in man as that to which we apply the term *reason*.

Talk to a stranger as long as you please, about some new invention, and give him the name applied by the inventor; but, so long as you do not compare the unknown object with something familiar to him, he will never form any correct idea of it. Bring him near the object, and he will readily determine whether it is round or square, transparent or opaque, &c. But a still closer examination is necessary to determine its qualities and uses.

When a person first comes in sight of your no-

ble Monument,\* he will pronounce it an immense elevation of something, he knows not what, fit only to be gazed upon by the humble tenants of its footstool, to remind them of the Father of his country, and the affection which his country bears him. On a nearer approach, his vision tells him it is an immense pile of solid marble, accessible only to the top of its basement, to any but the tenants of the air; but, what are his astonishment and delight, when he enters that basement, and finds himself, after taking some steps, elevated to a height from which he can discover, at a glance, the general appearance and the relative situation of all the hills and vales of your interesting city; beholding, as removed above the reach of good or evil influence, the busy, bustling scenes in which the never-tiring sons of earth delight to mingle!

What must he now think of the *reason* of his old companion, who, on entering the city with him, refused to take a closer view of this noble structure, declaring it a smooth column of marble, totally uninteresting, except to exhibit to the distant beholder the noble image at its summit!

The human body is provided, at its formation, with five different modes or means of receiving the forms or images or qualities of external objects, and of transmitting them to the brain, where they are safely fixed and long retained, by some yet unknown, undefined and *perhaps* forever undefinable power, called the *mind*: For example—

---

\*This Monument is made of marble outside, and brick and granite inside. Its base is several arches. A stair case of 225 steps, winds round a brick pillar, from the bottom, to the base of the capital on which stands the Monument of Washington. From this platform the spectator has a beautiful prospect of the whole City.

When you behold a fruit you never saw before, the eye immediately transfers its shape and color to the brain; the tongue and palate carry its qualities; these and the touch, its hardness or softness; the nose, its flavor, &c.; and thus all that is interesting in relation to it, is soon recorded, as with a pen of iron, in that faithful register, and forms a perfect image, called an *idea*. When another of the same fruits is presented, you receive and eat it or not, according as you were pleased or displeased with the first. Why so?

You answer—I know, by the shape and color, that this is the same kind of fruit, and has the same qualities as that I eat before. That was delightful to my taste and nourishing to my body:—I conclude this will be so too, and, therefore, anticipate much pleasure and profit in eating it. The comparison in the mind, of the second fruit with the first, by which the pleasure of eating was ascertained and partly enjoyed beforehand, is called *reasoning*, and the power by which the comparison is made, is termed the *reasoning* faculty. The same terms are applied to the comparison and the power that makes it, when the first fruit is unpalatable and injurious, and the sight of the second deters you from a repetition of the offence against your palate and system. Hence, reason, as a judge, cannot exist till the senses have been exercised.

The shape and color of the fruit, form one of the ‘distant’ ideas mentioned in the definition quoted; the good or bad result of eating it, the other; and the recollection of the first, and the comparison between the fruits throughout, the “intermediate ideas that connect the distant.”

Take another example. So long as you give an infant to eat, nothing but what is agreeable to its

taste, it will eagerly seize any thing you offer it; all its former experience testifying that this is the object of it. But, after you give it a medicine that is nauseous to the taste and sickening to the system, it will be very cautious about receiving any thing again from the same vessel, or even the same person. I have seen a child aged only a few months, manifest great apprehensions at the sight of its physician, and willingly fly from his presence, even in the arms of a stranger. It reasoned thus: What I took from that vessel, cup, or spoon, as the case may be, or from the hand of that man, tasted very disagreeable, and made me very sick. I will, therefore, take no more from it or him, lest a like thing return upon me.

"The burnt child dreads the fire," but the inexperienced will play with it. The innocent child will play with the adder, and stoutly maintain that it is reasonable to fondle with an object so beautiful. That a grown person's conduct and his reasons for for it, are the very reverse of this, is owing, not to any different properties of the mind, but to his acquired knowledge of the nature and character of the reptile, and the consequences of such imprudence.

By these, and thousands of other examples that will strike the minds of my intelligent audience, it is clearly demonstrated that the origin of reason is to be set down precisely at the period of life when the reasoner first compared an idea or image of an external object, with another similar idea or image, which had previously been fixed upon the mind; that the reason of a man is nothing more nor less than this *comparing faculty*; that the reason of an action or thing, is the comparison of one action, idea or image, with another, and the



decision resulting from that comparison; and that reasoning is the art of making that comparison, and drawing the conclusion.

Let us now attend to our second head:

## THE PROGRESS OF REASON.

Once, the most scientific and reasonable men that the world produced, supposed that the earth stood still, and the sun, moon and stars revolved about it every twenty-four hours; that the planets, except Mercury and Venus, went around both, and that these vibrated like the pendulum of a clock, suspended from the earth, and extending sometimes a little beyond, and sometimes a little short of, the distance to the sun. To sustain these opinions, the world was filled with rolls on rolls of *reasons* that were deemed incontrovertible. In process of time, the immortal Ptolemy made certain discoveries which convinced him that the sun was the centre of the system, about which all the other heavenly bodies revolved. But, though he too gave his reasons, yet, because the reasons of this one man were opposed to the reasons of all his cotemporaries, it was deemed reasonable to suppose that his must be *unreasonable*; and they were so considered and treated, till the famous Copernicus flourished. He revived this supposed unreasonable system of Ptolemy, and was fortunate enough to prove to all the world that he whom they had hitherto deemed most unreasonable, was the most rational man of the age.

The prince who was solicited to purchase a copy of the first printed edition of the Bible, deemed it so unreasonable that the book could be sold for some hundreds of dollars, that the bare offer to sell

it so low, was a sufficient reason for subjecting the seller to criminal process. But the true facts and reasons of astronomy, and the all-important truths of the Bible, are now printed and sold so extensively, that he who would ask more than a few cents for either, would be deemed as unreasonable as once were the philosopher and the printer.

On the subject of number and measure, however, reason has never been chargeable with fluctuations. The reason why the three angles of a triangle are equal to a semi-circle, or to two right angles; why twelve times twelve make one hundred and forty-four, or why the area of a square is equal to the sum of the areas of two others squares based upon the legs of a right-angled triangle whose hypotenuse forms one side of the square, are precisely the same now that they were in the days of Euclid or Diophantus. True reason therefore, is immutably the same. What is changeable or progressive, is properly termed error.

From the foregoing facts and arguments, and others of the same nature, we are warranted in the conclusion that—

1. The reasons we offer for our opinions on any subject, are correct or incorrect, according to the extent and accuracy, or the scantiness and confusion of our examinations of the whole nature and bearing of the subject.

2. That, when we know all that can be known of a subject, and have examined it in all its possible bearings, (as in the mathematical examples,) our reason will be perfect and permanent.

3. That we ought not to be satisfied with our conclusions on any subject, till our knowledge is as full and perfect as the nature of the subject will admit.

4. That, whenever we pronounce unreasonable any thing about which we have not (as in the mathematical cases) had all the information that can effect our conclusions, we injure ourselves in two ways: 1st, we prevent ourselves from seeking or receiving more correct information; and, 2nd, we expose our want of knowledge, and (what is worse) of mental discipline, to the pity, if not the ridicule, of those who are better educated. The man A, who refused to examine minutely the "marble pillar," as he called it, still believes his reason a good one, while B who ascended its winding staircase, well knows that this reason is as void of foundation as the interior of that noble Monument is of the beautiful material that appears upon its surface. And, if B should at last be pronounced superior to A, (as he certainly will,) it is not because of any original difference in the structure of his mind, but because he has been more patient and persevering in his search after truth, and especially because he never closed his mind to further information and the correction of his errors, by *pronouncing* unreasonable, what he did not *know* to be so. So much for our reason, as a guide in physical inquiries. Let us see whether it is any better director in moral researches.

Many years ago, a gentleman was arraigned at the bar of justice in Trenton, New Jersey, for horse-stealing, &c. The witnesses were summoned, their testimony was clear, united and satisfactory, not only to the court, but to the multitudes that thronged the halls of justice, to see what would become of the interesting culprit.—Respect for his known virtues and his sacred office, compassion for what all deemed a good man fallen in an unguarded moment, and regret at the dis-

grace which the transaction might bring upon a cause dear to the hearts of all good men—all were in his favor: but, alas! *reason* said, that, in a case so clear, truth and justice, as well as the interests of good order and government, demanded the sacrifice; and the Judge, with a heavy heart and a swimming eye, was about to drown a whole assembly in tears, by merely speaking aloud the silent convictions of every conscience, when a man and his wife, who had travelled on foot all the way from Delaware, for the purpose of rescuing from infamy and suffering their friend and benefactor, rushed before the Judge, and declared that, as the prisoner spent, at their house in Delaware, the very day on which he was said to have committed the crime in New Jersey, he could not be the proper object of that legal retribution. I need not add what a joy beamed in every countenance, when *reason*, thus enlightened, exclaimed, “the prisoner’s free!”

Before civilization dawned upon the inhabitants of India, *reason*, (all the reason they exercised,) taught the Hindoos the necessity of *caste*, (that is, that every child should continue in the same rank in society that his father occupied,) of sacrificing widows on the funeral pile prepared to consume the dead bodies of their husbands, and of offering human beings, even their own children, to their wooden gods, to serpents, and to fishes.

As civilization advances, they abandon these abominations, break the tyranny of *caste*, educate and cherish their daughters, crumble their idols in pieces, and render religious homage to Him only to whom it is due. And still, as before, they think they have a good reason for all they do.

*The progressive improvement of our reason, then,*

is always in exact proportion to the degree and accuracy of our practical knowledge of the subject about which we reason, and of the skill with which we detect the relations of resemblance, and of cause and effect, be these subjects what they may.

The conclusions of our reason on physical, literary, and scientific subjects, is called judgment; and no man is blamed for want of a good judgment! The deductions we draw from the consideration of moral and religious doctrines; and duties, constitute what we call conscience; and we censure no one, nay, we commend every one, for acting according to the dictates of conscience! And yet, who does not perceive that a wrong judgment and an erring conscience, are the effects of imperfect observation, are premature decision; and, of course, just as reprehensible as *laziness* and *rashness*?

From what has been said upon the origin, the nature and the progressive improvement of reason, we shall scarcely be at a loss to determine in what its perfection consists. In the mathematical cases alluded to, this perfection has been already exhibited. In many branches of natural philosophy, chemistry, &c. we are authorized to believe that it has been nearly or quite attained—as illustrated in the periodical revolutions of the planets, their relative distances, the number and character of the mechanical powers, the nature and properties of various chemical substances, &c.

To recapitulate, then, I observe—The origin of reason, in its common acceptation, is the period when we first use the recollection of our previous experience to govern, in any degree, our future thoughts or actions. Its very nature consists in

the skill with which we distinguish resemblances in similar objects, the differences in dissimilar, and the true relations between cause and effect; and its perfection is the due consideration of every circumstance that can, in any conceivable degree, affect the correctness of our decisions.

It will be found to preside in our private concerns, when it directs all our thoughts, words and actions, into that train which will best promote our present and future happiness, and that of those around us; in our religious duties, when it brings us up to the golden rule of duty:—"To love the Lord our God with all our heart, and our neighbor as ourselves;" in our literary pursuits, when we devote ourselves to those arts and sciences, and those only, which we can render the most useful to ourselves and others; in government, when the laws are made and administered for the benefit of the whole, uninfluenced by party considerations, and in medicine, when that science teaches us to conquer every thing that is properly called disease.

Let us now examine, in detail, some of the prominent notions in society, and see how far they who advance or countenance them, are entitled to the honorable appellation—*rational beings*.

1st. It is thought impossible for a man whose education had not enabled him to profit by the experience of those who lived before him, to discover natural laws, and lay down rules of science which shall be worthy of the attention of the most profound scholars of the age. But, is it more unreasonable than that Galileo should show the practical navigator how to traverse the ocean? that John Faust, the goldsmith, should teach the philosopher, the politician and the divine to multiply their tracts

and books ten thousand fold, and speak to all the world through the simple medium of the press? that Robert Fulton, the painter, should tell all the mechanists of the world how to navigate the ocean by the power of steam? that Whitney, the school-master, should discover to the planter a simple means of clearing out the seeds of his cotton, and thus to multiply the value of that production?—Are not the store-houses of nature equally open to all? Cannot one man observe a plain matter of fact nearly as well as another? And is it reasonable to say that any thing is perfect, susceptible of no further improvement, so long as it does not answer the end for which it was designed?

It is said that Dr. Thomson was and is an ignorant man, and, therefore, certainly unqualified to teach professors their art. Ignorant! Of what was he ignorant? Of Latin and Greek, and the names applied to disease? Grant it. But of what use is Latin or Greek, in helping a man to discover the effect of an external agent on the body? Cannot a man witness the operation of Lobelia, without knowing that the Doctors call this peculiar effect of the system *emesis*?\* Is it not as easy

---

NOTE.—In the sequel of this discourse, we shall have frequent occasion to use the term physicians. But we wish it distinctly understood that our warfare is against errors and not men. It has been very pleasant to us to be acquainted with many distinguished men of this profession; and though, as among all other classes, there are many narrow and prejudiced minds, and some mean and groveling hearts; yet, as a body, we esteem them as laborious and faithful in their profession; as anxious as any others to relieve the sufferings of their fellow men, and as willing to make or adopt any thing which, in their opinion, can be considered a real improvement in their art. We hope, therefore, that no expression of ours may give personal offence; for certainly no such thing is intended. We believe that the “science of medicine” is constructed entirely upon a false foundation, and our only objection to its supporters is, that they will not open their eyes to the light that might enable them to discover their error,

to discover the effect of that which relieved a man of disease, as of that which removed his hunger and thirst? And does it require a vast amount of Latin and Greek, to describe, *in English*, these operations and their causes? Can that man be called ignorant of what will relieve hunger, who has used bread, meat, &c., for this purpose, for twenty years, and never known them to fail? As well may Dr. Thomson be said to be ignorant of what will cleanse the phlegm and canker from the stomach, overpower the cold, remove obstructions, and reinstate the system. For he has been engaged in this business more than forty years, and with complete success, wherever there were faithfulness in the patient and a constitution to recruit. Can he not tell to plain men, in a plain way, *how*, with *what means*, and *why* he does this, without an acquaintance with Latin or Greek, or even with the endless and fruitless speculations of the learned on the same subject, who, with all their knowledge of each other's errors in theory and mischiefs in practice, have never yet discovered how to accomplish this desirable object?

The notion that those who study the longest after a particular object, will be the most sure to find it in the end, reminds us of the argument of a boy that had been angling. A and his brother went on a fishing to the same brook. A went directly where the fish resorted, caught many and soon returned home. B toiled hard and long to little purpose, because he fished at random; and, when he came home, was invited by A to partake of a dish of well served fishes. But he strenuously refused, giving it as a reason that, as he had labored long and hard about the same stream, and caught nothing, it was impossible that A should have provided the



dish of which he was invited to partake. A stranger was informed that it was only fifteen minutes walk to the place he wished to find. "That can't be true," said he, "for I have already walked an hour, and have not yet found it!" Dr. Thomson tells physicians that, *under their very feet* grow sure and safe remedies for all forms of disease.—That can't be, say they, for we have searched four thousand years without finding them. You have searched afar for poisons, instead of antidotes, says Thomson. But we are numerous and learned, and, therefore, must know better than you where and for what to search. If you prefer your blind sophistry to plain matters of fact, take your own course, is the reply.

It is said, "Grant that Dr. Thomson may have discovered something that is good in certain forms of disease, it is unreasonable to believe that one remedy can cure all diseases."

In the first place, we remark, that Dr. Thomson does not pretend "to cure all diseases with one remedy." He has pointed out more than seventy of the best articles of the *materia medica*, and given his followers certain plain rules for the discovery of as many more as they please. But, suppose he had said that all forms of disease might be cured by the administration of a single article; it would not be unreasonable, because it is not impossible. Indeed, analogy proves it quite possible. We well know that the single article of bread will sustain the life of man, and promote the growth of animals of almost every kind. I have seen a full grown ox that had never eaten any thing but milk. These articles of food will produce, in man, nails and hair; in horses, solid hoofs; in oxen, divided hoofs and horns; in cats, fur

and claws; in fowls, feathers; in fishes, whole-some food; in serpents, poison, &c. The cure of "all diseases" with one article, would not appear more singular than this. Is it not therefore, not only *possible*, but even *probable* that one substance may yet be found that will remove all the aches and ills which flesh is heir to? Would such a discovery surprise the thinking and ingenious of the present day, more than the sight of a locomotive steam engine would have surprised the dwellers upon earth a century ago? And would *they* not have been as reasonable in declaring impossible, what *our* eyes now see, as *we* are in saying that "it is impossible ever to discover a universal remedy for all diseases?"

Again, it is said that the vast variety of diseases to which the human frame is subject, cannot be traced to the same cause. You are, therefore, wrong in saying that disease is *one*.

We answer, first—If, in this assertion, we err, we are in company with not a few of the greatest men that ever devoted their attention to the science of medicine.

But how is this error proved? The Thomsonian believes in the unity of disease; others believe in a great diversity of diseases—each acts according to his faith. He uses universal remedies; they use an endless variety of *local*. What is the result? He *cures* all that are not constitutionally dead: they *lose* often the most robust and promising youth.

To illustrate.—"I doubt not," says one, "that the Thomsonian System is good in many cases; but it is unreasonable to suppose that the icy grasp of cholera, and the scorching flame of a bilious fever, should be met upon the same principles, or with the same remedies." Let us see.

There is a cholera patient with the premonitory symptoms fairly developed, surrounded a by host of the Regular Faculty. A exclaims, Ah! this is a bad case. What shall be done? Bleed freely, says B. But this is too late for bleeding, says A. Bleed as long as the pulse can be felt, says B, and then you may use blisters and other remedies with some prospect of success. Calomel is my sheet anchor, says C. But the case is too far advanced; the patient will die before calomel will take effect.\* I have nothing better, says one, but let us be cautious, and give ten grains every hour till it operates. Ten grains! says another; violent cases require a bold practice! I give two hundred and fifty at once! Don't deal so rashly, says D. Dip him in a warm bath, and give him a drop or so of camphor, and repeat. Emetics are my chief dependence, says E. They'll do in the first stage, says D, but I think this patient is too far gone.—Friction, friction, says F; yes, with cayenne, says one—no, with spirits of turpentine, says another. Brandy or vinegar will do, says a third. Gastric excitement, says G; an emetic, and a blister to the whole epigastrium. Heat him, says H; give him something hot, and put hot bricks to him, rub him with hot liniments, bottles of hot water will be good by his side; and, if you can't bring him to his senses without, sear his back with a hot poker! (Done in Richmond, Va.) Immerse him in a hot bath! I think his stomach is hot enough now, says I;—I am for giving him ice. Just think of that, says J. I is for cramming ice into his stomach; and yet that is the only part about him that is not already as cold as ice. Judge whether any

---

\*Dr. Clary's letter—Thomsonian Recorder, Vol. 2, page 380.

thing else is wanting to kill him. Kill him, says K; every thing I have heard proposed yet, is better calculated to *kill* than to *cure* him. Laudanum, says L, will check the disease till something else can be done. Mustard plasters should be applied immediately, says M. Nitre will cool the internal fever, says N. Opium and camphor are my dependence, says O. Precisely opposite, says P; a stimulant with a sedative! Whatever is done, must be done quickly, says Q. Rub the extremities, says R. This can't be wrong if it should not relieve. I've some confidence in saline emetics, and even saline injections into the veins, says S. I believe the serum of the blood must be restored. That's been often tried in vain, says T, and the operation is tedious and troublesome.—Venesection is doubtless proper sometimes, says V, but it is vain in this case. If you wait much longer, it *will* be, says W. Ten grains of calomel, every hour, till it operates, can do no harm, says X. Your theories and your practices are all wrong, says Y. You may take your own courses. [*Aside.* I shall imitate the Thomsonians as closely as I can, “without appearing to countenance empiricism,”\* or to acknowledge any obligations to that arrant system of quackery. I shall give Eupatorium and Ipecac, and cover with blankets till I have cleansed the stomach and promoted perspiration, and finish with half a grain of calomel, one and a half grain of camphor, and ten or twenty of cream of tartar, just to appear scientific, and then, if my patient gets well, the fact will afford abundant evidence that emetics and sudorifics are good medicines in skilful hands !]

---

\* Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, Vol. 9, 122. Dr. Clary's Letter, Thomsonian Recorder Vol. 2, page 386.

It is known to every one in this assembly, who has seen any cholera treatment, that this is no picture of the fancy. It is a very imperfect sketch, falling far behind the reality of what many of us have seen and heard, of medical views and practices.

"For, all the various notions to relate,  
Would tire ev'n Fabius with eternal prate."

Could there have been greater confusion even at the foot of the Babylonian Tower? Would any one imagine that all these diverse and opposite opinions, and empirical modes and means of practice, were learned at the footstool of the "highly cultivated and progressively improving science of medicine," which scorns to stoop in any respect "to a level with mere charlatanism?"\* Would he not rather conclude with Z, the spectator of the above consultation, that all the learned have yet disclosed in relation to this disease, is a "zeal without knowledge?"—a zeal for success in the exercise of their profession, without the knowledge of the proper mode and means by which it may be obtained.

But yonder is a different scene. A miserable victim of cholera, cramped in the chest and bowels, pulseless, cold and purple at the extremities, begging for water with an unearthly voice, echoing as it were from the long, dark vista to the valley of death! But there come a dozen Thomsonsians, who perhaps never saw a case of cholera in their lives. The first one that touches him, calls out, "he is cold." With a united voice, they cry, "raise the heat, throw out the obstructions, and tone up the system." One asks, How is all

---

\* See Dr. M. Burton's letter to the citizens of Richmond, after his return from an inspection of the cholera to N. York, in 1832.

this to be done? Do you profess to be a *Thomsonian*, and start such a question as that? Away with such a wolf in sheep's clothing. A says I've No. 6; B, here's third preparation; C, I've cholera syrup; D cries, *Any thing that's hot, and he that gives it first is the best physician in the case.* There is no argument here; every one knows what is to be done, and no one stands idle till all is accomplished. Thus, not unfrequently, in three hours, the man is in better health than he had enjoyed for a long time.

Take another example.—

Bring into the first consultation room a violent case of fever. Dr. A says it proceeds from cold; the patient must be bled, to reduce the inflammatory diathesis. B says, put a blister to the side, to guard against pleurisy, and then give mild sudorifics, such as spirits of Nitre, &c. But C declares he is bilious, and must have fifteen grains of calomel, repeated if necessary, (i. e. if this dose does not completely subdue the effort of nature to throw off disease—and so they go.) We have seen the above practice, where it was afterwards proved that the fever did not proceed from any of the causes enumerated, and of course all this cruel treatment was wrong upon their own principles.

Carry a similar case to the Thomsonian club. "He has a fever," says one. "There are obstructions some where," cry the rest—"Raise the heat, open the pores, relax the system, drive out the obstructions, and tone him up."

No sooner said than done. Sometimes a cold chill is driven to the surface, large quantities of phlegm are thrown from the stomach, a warm perspiration succeeds, and the man is well. The pa-

tent doctors declare, 'twas only a severe cold, and patient and all rejoice in his escape from it, with something of the feeling with which the traveler reviews, in the morning, the dangerous precipice along whose brow he had unconsciously walked the dark evening before.

In another case the skin would have been covered with morbid secretions; acrid bile and rotten canker would have been thrown from the stomach, &c., without any of the chills, cold sweat or phlegm, exhibited in the first. Indeed, say the doctors, yours was a real case of bilious obstruction. We hope the bile will be better employed hereafter, than in souring the stomach, or traveling through the pores to the skin. Take your supper, tone the stomach, keep up the heat, and all will be well.

These comparisons are but the simple relations of matters of fact that have come under our own observation.

Whether it is most reasonable to approve, because it is fashionable, the course that lost the patients, and to reject, because they who exercise it are said to be ignorant, that which restores them to health; or to adopt that, wherever you find it, which is known by its fruits to be sure and safe, we leave every one to determine for himself.

But we are willing to compare theory as well as practice. We proved, in the beginning of this lecture, that all sound reason is the fruit of experience. Having examined the parent, we need not fear to catechise the child. What then is the opinion of physicians about the origin, the nature and the proper treatment of Cholera? We have already shown what every news-reader knows, that

there are few opinions on either of these points, in which any two of the Faculty agree.

To give reasons for their practice, then, we confess we are altogether too ignorant. But, ignorant as we are, we will give you the reasons on which Thomsonians act.

1. In every case of cholera, they find the natural quantity of vital heat diminished. Reason says this loss should be restored.

2. All their experience tells them that, whenever the health is bad, there are proportionate obstructions in the system, or losses of power in the digestive or other organs, or both. No known case of cholera is exempt from these defects.

3. Reason, therefore, teaches them, whenever they find a new case, to remove those obstructions and strengthen the system. This done, the patient is well.

4. But what is the immediate cause? Answer.—Sudden cessation of powerful excitement, which carries off the heat faster than it is generated, till the internal preponderance is lost. Hence, reason teaches us to restore the balance of power, and experience proves that reason *right*.

What are the remote causes?

Probably too large a proportion of nitrogen and poisonous miasmata in the atmosphere, combined with the loss of vital power, occasioned by obstructions in the stomach.

What are the several excitements? Crude food, inebriation, fear, and severe exercise, are the principal, as every case proves.

But, must not a physician treat his case according to symptoms? Certainly. That is just the way Thomsonians work.

If they find the patient cold, they heat him;



If feverish, they sweat him;  
 If vomiting, they clear out the offensive matter;  
 If weak, they strengthen him;  
 If cramped, they relax his muscles;  
 If obstructed, they remove the obstacles;  
 If hungry, they feed him, &c. Is not this conduct reasonable!

But, is it not unreasonable to undertake to cure the man before you tell him his disease? As unreasonable as it would be, to put an eyestone into the eye, before you explained the peculiar nature and form of the mote it is designed to extract.—There is no harm in telling him, *if you know*. But the most important matter with him is, to get rid of the disease; then he will be *more certain* what it was, and converse about it with more satisfaction.

“But you, Thomsonians, must sometimes do great harm, by giving your medicines at random, without knowing what the disease is.” That *would* be true, if, like our opponents, we used what could do injury in any case; but all our medicines are in *harmony* with life, at war only with disease; and hostile to that in all its Protæan forms.

“Now, we know that you are unreasonable; for that is as much as to say that all diseases are one, and that you have a universal remedy.”

We do say that all diseases are one, and we confidently declare that the wisest men that ever ranged them under different names, have never been able to distinguish between them, or to find a remedy that would infalliably cure one, (without injury to the body,) that would not also cure others. What mean the pretensions, for example, that Swaim’s and Phillips’s Panacea will cure a long list of diseases, if not that these diseases have

one common origin? We are sure that we have as good reason for believing that all natural disease springs from one cause, and may be cured by one remedy, as you have for believing that all the moral symptoms, as exhibited by the inmates of our prisons, proceed from one cause—the corruption of the human heart; and may be cured by one medicine—the blood of Christ. If the very hairs of our heads are all numbered, and it is as easy for Him who provided one universal remedy for the sick soul, to provide another for the body, is it unreasonable in us to suppose that He *may* have done it? Nay, is it not most reasonable to suppose that he *has*?

But, you say, if so, he would have told us what the remedy is. As well might you undertake to prove that there is no Gospel, because it is not revealed to every heathen. It is not impossible that one remedy may yet be found which will contain all the qualities which we find in many, and be so adapted to the human system, as to aid it successively in a regular process against disease, and in favor of life, till the desired object be fully accomplished.

Dr. Thomson does not pretend to have discovered such a single article, but he has discovered sundry different articles which, used in due succession, will do more to remove disease than all the remedies that were ever discovered before, and that may be so compounded, even by art, as to be given at the same time with almost equal success. He, therefore, that has put the several remedial qualities into a few different vegetable forms, *can* and *may* have made one plant contain them all. I dare not say he *has* not, and I will add, some plough-boy is as likely to discover that plant, as a Hippocrates,

a Galen, a Sydenham, a Cullen, a Rush, or a Waterhouse.

Of one thing we are certain. The Thomsonian remedies are *not only* the most *valuable* remedies that have ever been discovered, but they may be safely and successfully administered by the hand of every man or woman who is worthy to be counted the head of a family; and, though we have no objection to the future discovery of the one remedy, to which we have alluded, yet we do feel it to be one of the most important duties we owe to our suffering fellow-beings, to use all our influence, that the knowledge of the virtues and uses of those already discovered, should be universally diffused.

---

The next day, the Curators of the Philosophical, Literary and Scientific Society, styled "The Baltimore Lyceum," sent Dr. C. a resolution requesting that he would deliver to that Society, on the 22nd, "a lecture on the Thomsonian System of Medical Practice," stating that, after the delivery of the lecture, the question, "Ought the Thomsonian Practice to be encouraged?" would be debated and decided by the Society. In compliance with that request, Dr. C. delivered the following

### LECTURE,

*On the intrinsic and the comparative merits of the Thomsonian System of Medical Practice.*

The Botanic System of Medical Practice is altogether the fruit of experience. It had no part of its origin in hypothesis, nor has it ever been the least improved by mere abstract speculation.

In his youth, the author of this System Providentially discovered that a certain plant possessed the power to eject, in a short time, with very little pain or inconvenience, and with no evil consequence whatever, any foreign or morbid matter from the human stomach. He afterwards observed that, whenever this operation had been thoroughly performed, sickness at the stomach, headaches, vertigo, fever, pain over and in the eyes, morbid appetite, indigestion or dyspepsia, mental aberrations, nightmare, and a host of other aches and ills that flesh is heir to, took a speedy departure from the fortunate patient. The experiment was repeated on others who suffered under the same maladies, and the result was uniformly the same.

It was observed, however, that, in cases where the patient was cold or the stomach acid, the operation, though in character the same, was more tedious and less thorough. To obviate these difficulties, resort was had to those warming stimulants which experience, in their use for food &c., had abundantly proved to be calculated to generate heat in the stomach and diffuse it over the body; and to the use of pearlash, whose well known property is to neutralize the acid. In the mean time, observation had disclosed the fact, that certain vegetable decoctions would detach the cold phlegm and morbid canker from the folds of the mucous membrane of the stomach, and thus greatly facilitate, as well as enhance the value of the operation. These same medicines were found to produce the same effect upon the bowels, whenever *they* were disordered.

Experience has ever taught that no man suffers under the influence of a scorching fever, while in

a state of free perspiration. The same experience teaches that the most favorable situation to induce that condition of the body, is immersion in some kind of warm vapor. The boy that stows away the new made hay, or he that explores the tobacco sweat-house, always returns under the influence of a free perspiration. It only remained then for art to devise the most convenient and effectual means of imitating nature's own plan, of throwing all obstructions from the pores of the external surface, to complete the process of discharging morbid matter of every character and description, from every portion of the system. The various modes by which steam, either simple or medicated, is applied to the surface of the body, sufficiently answer this purpose.

In cases where disease or improper medical treatment had debilitated the system, it was observed that something more was necessary to complete a cure, than merely to rid the patient of disease.

It was observed that the debilitated system was unable, without assistance, to maintain an amount of vital heat sufficient to sustain a free circulation; and that the digestive organs needed the aid of tonics to regain their elasticity. For the former of these purposes, the most pure and wholesome stimulants were applied; and, for the latter, bitters in various forms were added to the most nutritious diet and beverage.

So far as it regarded the removal of disease from the body, and the restoration of debilitated organs to a healthy state, experience had now completed her work. I purposely omit, in this place, any special notice of the branch of medical practice called surgery, though I should do injustice to the

process already disclosed, did I not state that, by expelling all morbid matter from every portion of the system, it prevents the formation of those abscesses, tumors &c., which, under other circumstances, afford the principal subjects for surgical operations.

It now remains only to explain, for the benefit of those who have not discovered them for themselves, the nature of the human system, the principle of life, the nature and the character of disease, the manner in which it invades the body, the proper mode and means of expelling it from the system, and of restoring to a healthy state the debilitated organs.

Correct observation will show that the human body is an organized structure, containing an outer and an inner surface, every portion of which is a network, composed of the *ends* or *mouths* of an innumerable multitude of tubes, whose main bodies and ramifications extend through every portion of the system, and whose office is to absorb or discharge the various fluids that are received into, or formed in it. Into this body is implanted, at its formation, a principle called *life*, a principle which, whatever be its nature, is accompanied, when in health, with an amount or a degree of heat always considerably above that of the atmosphere in which the man is destined to dwell; and, with the power to bring all the digestive, absorbent, circulatory and secretive organs into action upon the food that is received for the nourishment of the body. Experience shows that any obstruction lodged in any one or more of these absorbent or secretive organs, is a cause of disease, i. e. a hindrance to the full and free exercise of the principle of life, in its processes of digestion and nourish-

ment. Should the stomach, the head and prince of all the digestive organs, be the seat of obstructions, the amount of vital heat is proportionally lessened at the fountain, the extremities become cold, the whole system is languid and full of pain, and tormented with alternate chills and fevers, till the obstructions are removed and the heat regains its empire.

Whenever obstructions clog the operations of life at the fountain, the vital heat diminishes, the arteries and veins of the extremities become partially collapsed for want of heat in the blood to keep them expanded, a smaller quantity of blood than usual flows through them; and, of course, the vibrations must become more frequent, to pass the whole through the heart in a given time. Another consequence is, an undue accumulation of blood and heat in the heart, lungs and brain, which heat presently finds its way to the contracted skin, where it accumulates, looks angry, and produces the peculiar effect denominated fever.

To expel this fever, we supply the fountain with additional heat, apply warmth and moisture to the surface to relax the pores, and then excite to action the secretory vessels, by means of diffusive stimulants. When all the proper evacuations from the pores of the surface, the stomach, &c., are effected; that is, when the obstructions are removed, the cause of the fever is gone, the arteries and veins being warmed and expanded, the blood returns through them in its usual quantity; the digestive organs being relieved, are enabled to resume their duty; there is no more occasion for fever; the man is well.

In regard to its porosity, and the fluids it contains, the human system very closely resembles a

sponge saturated with water. Every one knows that an undue pressure upon any part of this sponge, collapses the pores in that part, and forces the water which was contained in it towards the centre of the sponge. To make room for this, that which is near some other portion of the surface must necessarily be discharged. It is evident that, if the pressure be increased and extended, the discharge will continue till no fluid remains. So of the human system. While there is no undue local pressure upon it, all the natural fluids remain in it, in hydrostatic equilibrium, till they have undergone their accustomed changes, and then are discharged through their proper channels, in the manner prescribed by the laws of healthy action. But, whenever any undue pressure collapses the vessels of any one portion of the system, and extends itself towards other portions, the fluids are forced from these to the tenderest places of egress, where they rush with violence from the body.—This is the true cause of all hemorrhages, and every other unnatural and excessive discharge. To illustrate :

A patient was threatened with hemorrhage; a Botanic Physician was immediately called; the process of raising the heat, relieving the local pressure and discharging the obstructions, was strictly followed, and no hemorrhage occurred. A second person was threatened with the same disease, from the same cause. A learned Physician of the old school was called; he prescribed ice to be eaten (and applied to the body if necessary) and a quantity of pills of acetate of lead, sulphate of morphia, with other minor articles; one to be taken every six hours, till a dozen should be taken; promising the patient that there would be some check



to the hemorrhage after the reception of the third pill. The pills were taken and the ice eaten, as directed; but, instead of diminishing, the hemorrhage increased to an alarming extent. After twenty-four hours, a Botanic Physician was called. He used heat instead of ice, and relaxing fluids instead of astringent metals. In fifteen minutes the hemorrhage was evidently controlled, and in ninety minutes it entirely disappeared, no more to return. In a few days the patient was as well as usual. A third patient was threatened with the same disease, from the same cause; the regular practice was pursued under the direction of several eminent physicians, and in three weeks the patient was—dead!

The first patient followed the new practice from the beginning, and no bad consequences ensued. The second commenced with the old practice, grew worse, resorted to the new, and was soon cured. The third took the old course from first to last, when death closed the scene! We leave you to comment.

Another patient was laboring under an unnatural discharge of a different fluid. The prescriptions of the physician, for three weeks, seemed only to aggravate the disease. A Botanic Physician stepped in one evening, raised the heat, threw off the pressure, discharged the obstructions, and left the patient entirely free from trouble.

We do not pretend to any skill in surgery, but let us take a bird's-eye view of blood-letting, the extraction of tumors from the flesh, the discharge of abscesses and of morbid matter from the deep recesses of the body, the reduction of calculi, &c.

It has already been proved that bleeding is not required in any kind of fevers; it being necessary

in these cases only to warm and expand the collapsed veins and arteries, and remove the undue pressure.

A young wan was thrown from his horse and taken up senseless. He was carried into a house, where he immediately fainted. A surgeon would undoubtedly have bled him after his recovery from syncope, but a Botanic Physician entered the instant he fainted, and poured into his mouth some very hot medicine; he instantly revived, complained of cold, and was laid upon a sofa and covered with blankets. The hot medicine was repeated, a chill succeeded, the man talked at random for about half an hour, when a free perspiration broke out, his reason returned, and all was right. In another half hour he rose and walked a mile to his lodgings, as though nothing had happened.

A young lady fell from a carriage upon her face, where she lay speechless for ten minutes. A Botanic Doctor poured into her mouth a strong stimulus and an emetic; she immediately opened her eyes, (and her mouth which had been set,) and asked what he was doing? He assisted her into the carriage, drove three miles, giving occasionally, as she appeared to droop, a little more of the medicine; when she was carried into a house, she vomitted, and, in a few minutes, became rational; she was carried three miles further, where she passed the night, and where her friends strongly insisted that she should be bled by a surgeon present. The Botanist objected, and she was well the next day.

*Tumors.*—Mr. W. had a rising just below his knee, of more than twelve months growth. A surgeon made an incision one inch and a half long, and down to the bone; but nothing was discharged

save a little blood. A Botanist was called. He cleansed the general system, applied poultices to the tumor, and, in less than a week the surgeon's incision was entirely healed, while a natural opening was made about an inch below, which discharged a large quantity of pus—and from which, in a few days, he drew a white core an inch long and half an inch thick.

A gentleman had the rheumatism, and it settled in his leg and made it very painful. A physician poulticed it and gave him medicine till he became tired of the process, and quitted the patient, saying that the flesh must be laid open and the bone scraped. Not much liking the scraping, he applied to a Botanic Doctor, who soon restored his general health, drove out his rheumatic pains, and, in a few months entirely healed the sore leg, *without any scraping*.

*Abscess.*—A young man had an abscess formed on the lungs. After a few courses of medicine, a half pint or more of morbid matter was discharged, the sore soon healed, and the pain in the breast that had been endured for years, departed.

*Calculi.*—Two gentlemen were much afflicted with calculi: One went to Dr. Physick, and underwent the operation of lithotomy. The other had been confined to his bed many months, and was told by his physician he could never be cured. He called a Botanic Doctor who cured him in a single evening. His teas had the power to dissolve the calculi, and carry off the solution.

*Reduction of Dislocations.*—Experience has abundantly tested the fact that dislocations may be easily reduced after the relaxation that may be produced by a judicious use of steam and lobelia, &c., and fractured limbs, after being splintered

up, are easily preserved from mortification and soreness, and healed in a very short time, by a course of treatment which every one who understands the Botanic principles can easily apply.

But, let us not be satisfied with the arguments and testimony of friends only, especially as we can find the best authority for almost all we believe and teach, among the writings of the most eminent for learning and experience in the old-school theory and practice.

In the first place, it was the opinion of the celebrated medico-electrician, Dr. Graham, of London; of Dr. Brown, of Edinburgh, and of Dr. Rush, of Philadelphia, as well as Dr. Thomson, that disease is a *unit*.

2nd. The most important writers on the medical properties of the herb called *Lobelia Inflata*, are, Drs. Thacher, of Massachusetts, and Barton and Eberle, of Philadelphia. Dr. Thacher highly recommends *Lobelia* for croup, whooping-cough and hydrophobia. Dr. Barton recommends it in croup, instead of the antimonials, on account of its "more certain action;" and Dr. Eberle speaks of its excellence in croup, hernia &c. It is true these physicians caution us against the empirical use of the article, telling us that, in unskilful hands, and in over-doses, it has been *supposed* to have produced alarming and even fatal effects. But, in every case in which *they used it themselves*, they declare that it produced the *desired* effect. The only objection to it, drawn from their own experience, is its speedy and violent action. We have no objection to its speedy and violent action, because experience has assured us that this action is altogether in favor of life. Dr. Barton states, that "the United States do not contain a plant of

more unequivocal action on the system." Unequivocal, that is, uniformly the same on the same persons at different times, and different persons at the same time. In this high commendation of Dr. Barton, we can cordially unite. It is surprising with what accuracy experienced practitioners will predict the time and mode of the operation of lobelia, in a given case. I have known them, before they began, to predict the time within from three to five minutes, when a full course should be completed.

3d. In the Edinburgh Dispensatory, we are told that Capsicum Annuum is the purest stimulant known, and, in the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, it is stated that there is no other single article equal to it for the suppression of hemorrhage.

4th. In Dr. Barton's Medical Botany, the *Hydrastis Canadensis*, or Bitter Golden Seal of the Botanic System, is pronounced one of the very best of all vegetable tonics. Myrrh is considered, by medical writers, a valuable antiseptic, and sundry other articles, very important in the System, we expect will be as highly commended whenever their value shall become known to the Faculty.

5. *A word of commendation for steam.*—An eminent medical writer remarks—"It has been generally thought that one constant effect of the warm bath is, to relax and debilitate the body; but this idea is now admitted to be founded in mistake. It is an error to suppose that persons who have been immersed in the warm bath, are more liable to take cold; for the body is better able to resist cold after warm and vapor bathing, than at any other time." "The vapor bath used in this country [England] is simple in construction and

effectual in application. It is an apparatus to which the steam of boiling water, either simple or medicated, is conveyed through pipes from a common steam boiler. In this apparatus the stimulant power of heat is tempered and modified by the moisture diffused through the air, and, as the elastic vapor, like air, is a less powerful conductor of heat than a watery fluid, the effect of vapor in raising the temperature of the body, is much less than that of the hot bath. Its heating effects are also further diminished by the copious perspiration which ensues; so that, on every account, the vapor bath is safer, in most cases more effectual than the hot water bath, and may be employed with success, when the latter would be attended with danger. It may be applied also to the whole, or to any part of the body. To effect this, the steam is conveyed into a wagon-roof frame, under a blanket or other covering, to confine the steam. The temperature of the vapor bath is from one hundred and ten to one hundred and twenty degrees; and, though from ten to fifteen minutes is generally sufficient, there may be cases where an hour may be necessary.

Whenever the cold bath is deemed proper, the warm bath should first be used as a preparative. The bather should always go into a cold bath when warm, and seldom exceed one plunge, which produces a glowing and healthful appearance of the countenance, and an additional flow of spirits.—“After the body is properly dried and rubbed, the cool air is grateful and perfectly safe. There is no danger whatever from cold—we are less liable to take cold after warm and vapor bathing, than at any other time. When the bath is used for cleanliness, refreshment, or a luxury, the above rule admits of no exceptions.”

“The vapor bath is to be used in all cases of fever, when perspiration is particularly desirable. The more immediate and general effects of this bath in fever, are, that it disposes to a calm and sound sleep, and regulates the discharge from the skin; the increase of the symptoms is lessened, if not prevented; the head is prevented from delirium, and the symptoms are moderated until the disease terminates. It has also been found beneficial in inflammation of the bowels, complaints of the liver, dropsy, water in the head, glandular swellings of the neck, calculus complaints, gout, leprosy, white swelling, strangulated hernia, affections of the skin, &c.” Our author then gives a long list of diseases, in which he says the cold bath is injurious, and adds—“On the other hand, the warm and vapor bath, properly regulated, will be found principal agents in curing most of the foregoing disorders.”

“In eruptions of every kind, in œdematous [dough like] swellings of the limbs; in stiffness and contraction of the joints; in all those diseases called nervous; in every case requiring a course of mercury—[I should rather say, that has had a course of mercury—I know of none that requires it:] in early infancy; in the decline of life to the last stage of existence, the warm and vapor bath may be used with advantage and safety.”

Let it be remembered that, by our author, steam is considered the principal agent in curing, not only the diseases enumerated, but, nobody knows how many others, represented by the significant &c., and that the Thomsonians use internal remedies so much more active against disease, and in favor of life, as to throw steam, valuable as it is, into the character of a mere auxiliary—a faithful

nurse only that waits on the doctor. If steam alone, then, merits the high commendations I have quoted, what shall be the meed of praise awarded to a full Thomsonian course? Could even the author of the Botanic System himself, have desired a more particular or accurate description of his steam bath, or a more commendatory account of its usefulness and safety, than what is given in the above quotations? How completely does this author sweep away the objections of "weakening," "rendering liable to take cold," "causing inflammations," "congestions," "delirium," "engorgements," "hemorrhages," and a thousand other bugbear evils?

But, it may be said, this is only his opinion; he does not give the proof. Very well—let us draw the proof from other testimony.

"*Facts*.—Dr. Willich says, [Domestic Encyclopedia, vol. 1, page 160,]—The sweating or vapor bath is used in Russia, by persons of every rank and age, in almost every disorder, before and after a journey, hard work, &c. These are frequented at least once a week, or as often as possible, whether in a state of health or sickness.

The extraordinary degree of heat produced by the evaporation of water thrown upon red hot stones, in a close room, raises the thermometer to 146 or 168 degrees—a degree of heat considerably above that which melts wax, and only twelve degrees below that for boiling spirit of wine. In such a bath the Russians lie naked on a bench, notwithstanding a profuse perspiration, sometimes for two hours, occasionally pouring hot water over their bodies, and at length plunge over head into a large tub of water. Many rush out almost dissolved in sweat, and either throw themselves into



the adjoining river, or roll themselves in snow during the most piercing cold, without suffering any inconvenience, and probably with advantage; for we understand that rheumatisms are scarcely known in Russia, and there is great reason to attribute this exemption to the vapor bath."

Dr. Charleton, who used the warm bath freely, says, "Of 996 paralytics, most of whom had resisted the power of medicine, 813 were benefited by the proper application of the warm bath.—Ib.

In his views of the Russian Empire, the Rev. W. Tooke says, "It is not to be doubted that the Russians owe their longevity, their robust state of health, their little disposition to certain mortal diseases, and their happy, cheerful temper, mostly to their baths.

This remedy of nature's own invention, was employed with so much success that, for five hundred years, Rome had no other physicians."

M. Sarvay, in his letters on Egypt, says, "The Egyptians employ the vapor bath, for the purpose of procuring delightful sensations and removing that irksomeness and apathy which is the concomitant of an idle and sensual life," &c.

*Remark.*—The Turks, Egyptians and Russians bathe; the Persians and Hindoos champoon; the Russians plunge from the steam-room into rivers, or wallow in snow, and all for "pleasure," "luxury," "delightful sensations," &c. And shall we be told that a Thomsonian steam-bath, with all its concomitant circumstances, which would immeasurably enhance the value of the above mentioned vapor baths, is almost as much to be dreaded as death itself! Be assured, my friends, that they who speak any evil of such a bath, are either *very* ignorant themselves, or else they presume on an

ignorance in you, that is, to say the least of it, disgraceful to a free and enlightened community.

Dr. Cooper, of South Carolina, recommends a steam apparatus much like those used by Botanic Practitioners, and says he has often used it with a happy effect. Can the steam that is sanative and luxurious in South Carolina and Russia, that procures delightful sensations and a beautiful glow in the countenance in Egypt, Turkey and Persia, destroy all the health and beauty of the robust sons and fair daughters of this enlightened city? For myself, I can safely declare that, in all my observations of the practice on persons of all ages, of both sexes, in a great variety of conditions and diseases, I have never known steam to do the least harm. On the contrary, I agree most cordially with the authors quoted, "that, when properly regulated, the steam bath will always be attended with advantage and safety."

Here, perhaps, I ought to close. But the simplicity, efficacy, and value of the new mode of treating diseases, appear so much more evident, when contrasted with the old, that I feel it my duty to present a sketch of what a young man has to do, before he is prepared to exercise the healing art in what is called the regular mode. First—He must learn the situation, figure, proportion of—according to some authors, 210; according to others, 248 bones in the human system. To this knowledge he must add a similar acquaintance with one hundred and ninety-eight pairs and nine separate muscles, a vast number and variety of arteries and veins; of nerves and their ramifications, and last, but not least, he must become thoroughly acquainted with the structure, uses, position, &c. of the organs of respiration, of digestion, absorp-

tion, circulation and secretion. These being all tangible objects, time, patience and diligence, may enable the student to fasten their images on his mind. But his labor is just begun. He has now to learn the classes, orders, genera and species of diseases, with a compound definition to each, especially the latter, which amount, according to different nosologists, to from eighteen to twenty-five hundred. In one work he will find different species of disease ranged under the same genus, while in another, these species will not be deemed worthy of a place in the same class, and in a third, they will be considered anomalous, and thrown into an appendix, as unworthy of a place in any particular class.

An eminent medical writer remarks, that the acquisition and retention of the specific descriptions of diseases is utterly impossible, even to the most tenacious mind; and Doctor Rush, in the exercise of the same feeling, scattered all nosologies to the four winds of heaven, directing his followers to notice only whether the symptoms were atonic or *entonic*, and to stimulate or deplete accordingly. But there are yet to be learned the history, description and properties of 20,000 remedies, and their association with the several diseases which they are supposed to counteract. And, lastly, he must learn his lesson in Toxicology, that is, how to counteract the influence of these medicines, when they act as poisons instead of remedies! Thus caparisoned, he offers his services as a practitioner of medicine. But, just before he is called to a violent case of fever, he takes up a book, entitled "The Application of the Principles of Philosophical Investigation to the Theory and Practice of Medicine."—By John Abercrom-

bie, M. D., F. R. S. E., and First Physician to his Majesty in Scotland, and reads as follows:

“A writer of high eminence has even hazarded the assertion that those persons are most confident in regard to the characters of disease, whose knowledge is most limited; and that extended observation generally leads to doubt. When, in the the practice of medicine, we apply to new cases the knowledge acquired from others which we believe to have been of the same nature, the difficulties are so great, that it is doubtful whether, in any case, we can be said to act upon experience, as we do in other departments of science. For we have not the means of determining with certainty that the condition of the disease, the habit of the patient, and all the circumstances which enter into the character of the affection, are in any two cases, precisely the same: and if they differ in any one particular, we cannot be said to act from experience, but only from analogy. The difficulties and sources of uncertainty which meet us at every stage of such investigations, are in fact so numerous and great, that those who have had the most extensive opportunities for observation, will be the first to acknowledge that our pretended experience must, *in general*, sink into analogy, and even our analogy too often into conjecture.”

“The following apologue,” says D’Alembert, “made by a physician, a man of wit and of philosophy, represents very well the state of that science.” “Nature,” says he, “is fighting with disease; a blind man armed with a club; that is, the physician, comes to settle the difference. He first tries to make peace; when he cannot accomplish this, he lifts his club and strikes at random; if he strikes the disease, he kills it; if he strikes nature,

he slays *her*." "An eminent physician," says the same writer, "renouncing a practice which he had exercised for thirty years, said"—"I am wearied of guessing."

"But," continues the author, "even after we have ascertained the true relations and tendencies of things, we are constantly liable to disappointment in medicine, when we endeavor to produce certain results by bringing these tendencies into action. This arises from the silent operation of a new order of causes, by which the phenomena of diseases are varied and modified, and by which the action of external agents is aided, modified or counteracted, in a manner which altogether eludes our researches. The causes which thus operate are, certain powers in the living body itself, the action of which is entirely beyond our control; and others arising out of the peculiarities of age, sex, temperament of body or mind, and mental emotions; constituting a class of agents of a most powerful kind, of which it is impossible to estimate the combined operation. It is farther to be kept in view, that these various agents may be acting together, or in opposition to each other, or under a variety of combinations; and that, in reference to our attempts to act upon the body by remedies, they may be operating in concert with, or in opposition to, those attempts. Hence arises a most extensive source of uncertainty, in all our investigations, of which it is impossible to calculate the effect or the extent. Hence arises also that apparent want of uniformity in the phenomena of disease, by which we are so much impeded in our researches, and in the action of remedies, by which our efforts in their use are so often frustrated." Indeed, "why one medicine acts upon the stomach, another upon

the bowels, a third upon the kidneys, a fourth upon the skin, we have not the smallest conception. We know only the uniformity of the facts."

In his Dispensatory, he reads—"Of the modus operandi of mercury, we know nothing. It seems to subvert diseased action, by substituting its own peculiar action for that of the disease." Well, then, says the student, what is the peculiar action of this remedy? He turns to his manual of Toxicology, and is there informed that mercury is a poison, which, if the constitution of the patient should be unable to shake it off, as the Apostle did the viper, "without injuriry," "acts through the medium of the circulation, promotessalivation, rots the gums, loosens and destroys the teeth, and often the bones of the face, produces stiff and incurvated limbs, œdematous swelling, with loss of appetite, till death, in a few years, with a friendly stroke, puts a period to their sufferings."

To a benevolent heart, such as we delight to accord to every student of medicine, already bounding with the desire, and high in the ecstasy of the hope of soon being able to relieve the suffering of its fellow creatures, the perusal of such paragraphs as I have just now quoted, must prove what in common language would be styled a real damper. And so it appears to our young friend. What, says he, dropping the book on the table, and leisurely raising his spectacles from his eyes, after all my labor and expense, am I now to be assured that I cannot determine with certainty, the characters of the most common diseases, and whether I can or not, are my exertions to cure them, limited to the use of those means which, if they should fail to produce the desired effect, will most certainly undermine and ruin the constitution of my patient?

For he had just now read as follows:—"The action of external agents on the body, demands our attention in two respects—as causes of disease and as remedies, in both which respects their action is fraught with the highest degree of uncertainty." Ah! says he, medicines then are to be considered both our poison and our antidote; our bane and our blessing! I almost wish I had never put up my sign.—"Doctor," cries a messenger at the door, "Mr. A. is very sick and requests your presence immediately." Though he would gladly be excused, yet for consistency's sake he must go.—He musters his lancet, his opium and calomel, and waits on the patient. Here is a sick man to be sure, but the symptoms do not enable him to determine to which of all the 2500 descriptions of disease in his Nosology he ought to refer the case before him, and he feels the full force of the passage in Dr. Abercrombie's work which he had just read. It being impossible to determine the exact state of the case, he determines to treat it on general principles. The fever rages—he bleeds; the head is delirious, opium is administered. The tongue is rough and the skin sallow—so, though with much reluctance, and many misgivings, yet, because no substitute is known, down goes a dose of calomel, with orders to clear it out with a cathartic as speedily as possible, and the physician departs with a trembling step and a heavy heart.

With what different views and feelings the Botanic Physician approaches a similar case, they only can tell who have enjoyed them. He enters the room—ho!, my friend you have a fever. I am glad of that. It shows that you have some life in you. We have only to add a little more to it and you will soon be able to put your disease to flight.

He feels none of the responsibility of destroying the constitution of the patient, for he intends to give him nothing that would hurt him if well. He does not fear being unable to reduce the inflammatory action, because he knows that all such effects are produced by obstructions, and that the remedies he uses, in the language of Dr. Barton, "act most unequivocally on the system;" and, if given in sufficient quantities, under proper circumstances, will infallibly disengage the obstructions, expand the arteries and veins and restore regularity to the action of the blood and heat. In the course of three hours all this work is completed, and a few after tonics, with nutritious diet, restore the patient to his wonted health and activity.

In addition to the testimony of Dr. Abercrombie and others adduced, I may state that instances not a few, have come under my own observation, in which experienced physicians have totally misunderstood the character of the diseases and practised improperly according to their own principles. In not a few of these cases, after the physicians had exhausted their skill, the Botanist speedily restored the patient to health. Our time forbids me to give the particulars.

Finally, friends, I have given you a history of the discovery of the Botanic remedies, and of the arrangement into a system of the principles they developed. I have given you the most flattering testimony of the most eminent medical men, to the correctness of the system and the value of the principal remedies.

I have contrasted the simplicity of this system, the ease and expedition with which it may be acquired, and the safety and success with which it may be practised by any man or woman of com-



mon sense and decent education, with the vast labor, expense, time, &c., of acquiring even a moderate acquaintance with the regular practice, and the great danger and uncertainty in its exhibition when acquired. I hope, therefore, I shall not be criticised harshly, or judged uncharitably, if I conclude this address by stating that, for simplicity of theory, facility of attainment, certainty, safety, and efficacy of remedial action, and last but not least, the accommodation of the practice to the capacity of the heads of every family, thus enabling them to afford instant relief, often, when, if they were obliged to send for a physician, the disease would accomplish the work of death before he could arrive, the Botanic System of Medical Practice, in the opinion of your humble speaker, *is worthy of all acceptance.*

---

## CONTROVERSY IN GEORGIA.

If we are correctly informed, the State of Georgia has a statute, imposing, on all medical practitioners who cannot exhibit a diploma from some medical college, a fine of five hundred dollars for each and every *offence* of saving the people from death, or what is nearly or quite as bad, the poisons and depletions of "the regular medical practice." One half of this fine goes to the support of the medical aristocracy, and the other, to him who, after having been snatched, as it were, from the very jaws of death, or seen his neighbor thus rescued, is base enough to make the practitioner suffer for his benevolence, instead of endeavoring to secure to him a suitable reward for his labor of love.

Notwithstanding the existence of such a statute, an intelligent citizen informs us that there are, in that State, more than 20,000 Thomsonians who utterly refuse to bow the knee to this "image of Baal, which" the medical "Nebuchadnezzars have set up." Their influence long ago rendered the law a dead letter as to its penalties; but, as they were unable to collect by law, the reward due them for faithful services solicited by others, they last year (1834) began to talk of sending petitions for a repeal of the old medical law, or rather unconstitutional act, and the restitution to the people, of the usurped right of employing whom they pleased for a doctor, as well as a butcher, a cook or a nurse, and to the practitioner thus solicited, the right to collect, by law, remuneration for services faithfully rendered.

This proposition excited much talk in the land, and elicited no little slander against the Thomsonian Practice. Desirous to see "fair play" in the contest, a gentleman of high standing for talents, attainments and influence, sent to the Editor of the "Federal Union," the two lectures preceeding this note, with the following introduction, expressing his reasons for the request that they might be published.

## BOTANIC SYSTEM OF MEDICINE.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE FEDERAL UNION.

GENTLEMEN—The attempt made, during the last session of our Legislature, to tolerate, in Georgia, the practice of the Botanic System of Medicine, has, I believe, excited a strong desire, in the people generally of the State, to know something

definite of that system, and learn the amount of its pretensions. As it has, like most innovations, been preceded by an evil name, justice requires that its enemies should not be its only expositors. Its friends ought to have a hearing, subject to correction, and the whole matter, untrammelled by legislative shackles, should be committed to the judgment of the public, whose award would, whatever might be advanced to the reverse, be influenced alone by utility. Can science ask a nobler inquest, or justice more equitable terms?

To further this object, I have to solicit that you print the enclosed two Lectures, delivered, last autumn, in the city of Baltimore. They bear internal evidence of emanating from no ordinary mind. Neither may the author, with reason, be accused of ignorance, being intimately acquainted with the theory and practice of the regular school, while he has had ample opportunities of ascertaining the tendencies of the new—nor can his sincerity in relation to facts, be suspected, his veracity and morals standing unimpeached in the arena of the greatest opposition to him, and the position taken by him being in direct conflict with what would be his personal interest, could wealth seduce him into the advocacy of long-established opinions. His evidence may not, however, be conclusive. Enthusiasm may have warped his judgment. But, if so, it is the aberrancy of cultivated genius, beneficently engaged in a problem dear to the head and sacred to the heart.

Be that as it may, the insertion, in your paper, of the two Lectures, cannot be otherwise than desirable, as a matter of information; and, as the knowledge and talent of the faculty are sufficient to detect and expose any misrepresentations they

may contain, you ought not, from apprehension of consequent mischief, to exclude them. Indeed, as the subject is one of "life and death," I feel assured that you will, with alacrity and pleasure, yield to the wish of

EQUITY.

*April 14, 1835.*

---

The Editor of the Federal Union published the lectures with the following remarks.

**BOTANIC SYSTEM OF MEDICINE.**—At the request of a highly valued friend, we publish, from the Thomsonian Recorder, two lectures on the Botanic System of Medicine, which were delivered in Baltimore, by Dr. A. Curtis, of Richmond Virginia. Dr. Curtis is a religious man, of good standing in Richmond; and, so far as he narrates facts within his own knowledge, the fairness of his moral character is a voucher for the correctness of his statements. (1) In this controversy, almost all the talent and learning are confined to the ranks of the regular faculty; and we invite any of them who are disposed to vindicate the ancient theories against this modern innovation, to make use of the columns of the Federal Union for that purpose.

(1) [This, we afterwards accidentally discovered that, *somebody* learned, by inquiry by letters of prominent individuals living in Richmond.]

---

In answer to this invitation of the Editor, Dr. Edward Deloney of Talbotton, Georgia, sent him the following

## REMARKS,\*

Suggested from reading two Lectures on the Botanic system of Practice, delivered by Dr. A. Curtis, of Richmond, Virginia, before the Botanic Convention in Baltimore, October 16, 1834, and published in the Federal Union of the 14th. ult. at the instance of a writer over the signature of "Equity."

MR. EDITOR—A writer, over the signature of "Equity," has furnished the public, through the columns of your paper, with two lectures, on the Botanic System of Practice, so called, by a Dr. A. Curtis, of Richmond, Virginia; and, as you very liberally offer your columns to a free discussion of this subject, I propose only to make a few remarks. In doing so, I am fully aware that I am bestowing on that subject far more attention than it merits. Perhaps silence, on a subject which has so little importance attached to it, would be the better policy, and the *best argument* against a *system* which has no foundation in truth or common sense, and contrary to all enlightened reason. In vain has medical genius plodded the wearisome, intricate and rugged path of medical science, if it is now to be thrown twenty-five hundred or three thousand years back to find truth among the long cast off rubbish of the darkest ages of superstition, but such cannot be the case. We rejoice that the days of witchcraft and conjuration have long since passed by, and the days of quackery will soon fol-

---

\*Hitherto we have corrected the orthography, manifest slips of the pen, and the typography, in the articles of our opponents, as we would wish they should do to ours under like circumstances. But we forbear such corrections in Dr. D's. articles, for reasons which will be given hereafter.—ED.

low in their wake, and, although it may now seem to be in the sunshine of its glory, it is indeed gratifying to know that enlightened society wails its momentary triumph.

From the tenor of the remarks of the writer, in your paper, who requested the publication of the two lectures referred to, it appears that he is desirous for this system of practice to be *dubbed* with *legislative authority*. When the legislature of Georgia shall so far descend from its high dignity, as to *licence* a system of practice, if it may be so respectfully called, which embraces *quackery* in its fullest perfection, we may well shudder for the safety of the human family in the management of human disease—when life shall thus be committed, by *lawful authority*, into the hands of such a charge. Is not the writer, in your paper, aware of the character of the persons, as regards intellect, among whom these *steam books* are circulated, and who it is that presumes to *linker*, in this daring manner, with the lives of their fellow beings! The shocking results of such presumption, are already too numerous, without giving legislative authority for their *tenfold* increase. We trust that the enlightened *lawmakers* of Georgia will have more respect for science in general, and especially the medical science, in the great perfection to which it has attained by the constant and unwearied labours of men of the most splendid genius that has ever lived, than thus shamefully to mock at the glorious results of medical research and truth, that now beams upon the world, by licencing a system of ignorance that can never rise above the most groveling superstition, and whose motto is *havoc and dessolation*.

But to the subject-matter of the lectures. The

lecturer sets out with a great deal to say about *reason*, its progress, improvement, perfection, &c.; and, in his discussions on this head, he overthrows completely the ground work of his whole system, at least, so far as he attributes the discovery of Thomson's steam-practice to the result of *enlightened reason*; reason, he says is an *improvable faculty*, and all reasons are not *right reasons*. If then reason is an improvable faculty, the longer the *exercise of this faculty* is employed in the investigation of any one subject, the nearer to *perfection* and *truth*, the results of this investigation must lead us. Science is ever on the march, and continually opening to our senses new fields in which the mind may rove, without control, gathering the fresh and most beautiful flowers. And, if we are behind the age of improvement in which we live, we often become perplexed and entangled in a labyrinth of mazes, destitute of the power or means of extricating ourselves from the difficulties which seem to surround us; and this is because we have not kept pace with the march of improvement. Our *reason* and understanding is not sufficiently enlightened to enable us to behold the beauties and excellence of the subject which seem to mistify our ideas, and perplex and mortify our feelings. Many persons, in this situation, call smarter men than themselves, 'fools;' because they have not sense enough to understand them; and thus we may account why it is that Thomson has so frequently taken it upon himself to *dub* the members of the medical profession with the very polite and genteel appellation of "*learned fools*."

But to return: the march of enlightened reason, truth and science, as we have said, is onward, not like the generations of men, which pass into the

shades of oblivion and is forgotten; but they stand as *beacon-lights* to the rising genius, are grasped with avidity and investigated with care and diligence—the impurities and rubbish loped off, and the truths which are sifted from the chaff, are treasured up in sacred keeping. Thus fortified, the young mind, vigorous and in the prime of its youthful strength, like a tender vine, towering from limb to limb, securing firmly, in its winding grasp, the sturdy branches that is to support it in its more mature and fruitful age, seeks after increasing light and truth. Thus it is, the little boy of ten years old, may learn his younger brother the A. B. C. So reason, truth and science, wends their way, opening, to our enchanted view, vaster and brighter fields.

But says the lecturer, “all reasons are not *right reasons*.” This may be very true, and easily accounted for: men frequently reason wrongfully from wrong impressions; they are completely in the dark as regards the subject-matter of a thing, on which they attempt to reason; their minds have never been enlightened by the bright beams of truth and experience, flowing from the investigations and researches of men who have lived before them, and they must draw their own conclusions in the dark, of course, crude and erroneous, haphazard and at a venture, just as the rude imagination may suggest. Here then is man, in his primitive and unenlightened condition, with no guide but chance, and no reason but instinct; and this is the situation in which we find Thomson and his Practice. Without the aid of the smallest experience or literary attainment, a mind of the most ordinary capacity, his dwelling obscurity, with the presumption of a *philosophic fop*, he comes



forward, by his deluded followers with a *theory*, as old as the hills and a practice as dangerous as it is ridiculous and nonsensical, in bold opposition to the experience and investigations of the greatest men of genius in the different ages of the world, from the days of Hypocrates, yea, from the days of Adam down to the present period. Surely the lecturer could not have the presumption to speak of the progress and improvement of reason as having attained to perfection during the natural life of one single individual in the person of Samuel Thomson, if he would reflect for a moment, how many hundreds of years have passed in the improvement of reason and science and the investigation of truth, without yet having attained to the perfection of either. If then we would wish to be guided by *right reason*, we must look to the *experimental and common sense proofs* of science, which result from the investigations of minds and genius guided and directed by the light of truth and plain facts, and not to new fangled doctrines or hypothesis, which have their origin alone in ignorance and superstition, disappointed ambition or deranged imagination, as dangerous in their consequences as they are unnatural and subversive of all principle.

We will proceed. The lecturer observes, "it is thought impossible for a man, whose education has not enabled him to profit by the experience of those who have lived before him, to discover natural laws and lay down *rules of science* which shall be worthy of the attention of the most profound scholars of the age." From the very tenor of the remarks of this quotation, the lecturer evidently disbelieves the position himself, and any man, according to his views, who may just have emerged from obscu-

rity, without reason, experience or common sense, is as capable of laying down *rules of science* worthy of the attention of the most profound scholars of the age, as any other man, though he may possess all the *light and knowledge* which the *progress and improvement of reason* has shed upon the human race, from its earliest existence; and, in this position of the lecturer, he controverts and completely overthrows all his previous arguments: for says he, "it is said that Dr. Thomson was and is an ignorant man, and therefore unqualified to teach professors their art, (and so say we if reason is an *improvable faculty*.) Ignorant! of what was he ignorant? of Latin, Greek and the names applied to disease. Grant it. But of what use are Latin and Greek in helping a man to discover the effect of an external agent on the body? Cannot a man witness the operation of *lobelia*, without knowing that the doctors call this peculiar effect of the system *emesis*?" What, we ask, could be a more perfect and contemptable ridicule of the improvement of reason, of *right reason*, and the march of science and knowledge, than is contained in the above short quotation from the lecture? He asks, of what use is Latin and Greek in helping a man to discover the effect of an external agent on the body? We answer by a knowledge of the Latin and Greek languages we are enabled to understand the the improvements which were made in the arts and sciences and the progress of enlightened reason, in the days when those languages were used among learned men in writing down the results of their researches and experiments. Did Dr. Thomson know there was such a thing as medicine before he heard some person say so? It is well known that he did not create such a word; and is not the lecturer aware that the Bible, which

has shed such blessings and benefits upon the world was originally written in the Hebrew and Greek languages; and does he suppose that Samuel Thomson or himself would have ever known any thing about the glorious promises that are contained in the lids of that precious volume, if some of the *learned fools*, as he is pleased to call them, had not been able to translate that book into plain English? Thus much have we gained by a knowledge of the Latin and Greek in the progress of religious science and the improvement of reason.—By understanding the Latin and Greek languages, we are enabled to understand the theory and the mode of treatment and remedies used by the ancients in the cure of diseases. Thus understanding, our reason becomes enlightened and “improved” by their experience, and we may be enabled to profit by the results of that experience. Does the lecturer suppose that a Frenchman, who knows nothing of the English language, could derive any benefit from Thomson’s book or his own lectures. But he says “cannot a man witness the operation of Lobelia, without knowing that the doctors call this peculiar operation *emesis*?” Granted: so, in ancient days, did the people know that winter came, spring, summer and autumn followed and winter came again, that day and night in regular rotation, went on their unwearied course, but they knew not the cause of this regular routine of season, and light and darkness. What now has enlightened us in this sublime and grand organization of nature, but the improvement of reason and the march of science? Thomson, or any other man of common sense, might see the peculiar action of any agent on the human system, so did the first Physician in the world mark these peculiar effects of plants or medicines on the human system,

but he knew not the mode of operation by which these effects were produced, and it was left for other men who were to succeed him, to improve by his observations and by the lights, which his experience had thrown on this subject. So reason progressed and the arts and sciences improved, but it now seems to be the opinion of some that medical science shall again go back to those rude & uncultivated ages, that we shall throw away the lights of [yes; Dr. Lieutaud, Synopsis, page 1st, and most of the French and many of the English writers of the present day, are of this opinion] experience and science, and again start anew, or in other words shall throw away the correct principle of medical theory and practice which now prevail and is founded in truth, and take up Samuel Thomson's lobelia and steam practice and all will be well.

As we proceed onward with the Lectures, we get deeper and deeper into the nonsensical jargon of the champion of steam. The Lecturer says; "Dr. Thomson tells physicians that *under their very feet* grow sure and safe remedies for *all diseases*. That cannot be, say they; for we have searched four thousand years without finding them. You have searched after *poisons* instead of antidotes, says Thomson." Now this confab of the champion of steam no doubt was thought wonderfully sagacious and edifying, by the learned Lecturer, we suppose then that Dr. Thomson was the first to discover, from the numerous plants which grow out of the earth, the only sure and safe remedies for all diseases, and when we come to find out the true nature of these *sure* and *safe remedies*—they all settle down into the famous Lobelia, the *remedy of remedies*. [Thomsonians use from fifty to one hundred articles. Dr. Thomson

describes more than seventy.—ED.] I wonder what the physicians done for *sure* and *safe remedies* before Dr. Thomson was born? But the inconsistencies, which are contained in the above short quotation are actually so glaring, that they are absolutely provoking. [It is always very “provoking” to a contentious man, to find something that he is totally unable to answer.—ED.] First, he tells you that diseases are all *one*: and, in the very next breath, he says, that Dr. Thomson tells you that under your feet *sure* and *safe remedies* for *all diseases*; [yes, all that you, doctors call diseases. We consider them only symptoms of disease.—ED.] again he says, “you have searched after *poisons* instead of antidotes.” Wonderful indeed! and is not Lobelia a poison, a very deleterious poison? Are not all medicines, which have a decided impression on the system, contrary to a natural and healthy action, *decidedly poison*, which, if used without judgment, and in sufficient quantities, will destroy life? And yet Dr. Thomson, through his agent Dr. Curtis, charges the medical profession with *hunting after poisons*, when, at the same time, the very champion-medicine of their quack system, I mean Lobelia, is *one among the most violent drastic and deleterious poisons* in the whole *materia Medica*, or of which the vegetable kingdom can boast. [Alas for Dr. D.’s experience!—ED.]

We have now come to the very *quintessence* of the first lecture: and the Lecturer takes a *cholera* patient to illustrate the unbounded and universally good effects of *steam*. It must, indeed, be a misfortune with the Thomsonians, that all diseases are not the cholera. He says, “there is a cholera patient, surrounded with a host of the re-

gular faculty. A exclaims, ah! this is a bad case; what shall be done? Bleed freely, says B. Calomel is my remedy, says C. Give him the warm bath and camphor, says D. Emetics are my chief dependence, says E.”—and so he goes on through the whole alphabet with this imaginary slang, until he makes the patient in imagination of his hearers or readers, in the last agonies of death, when, lo and behold! in comes a Thomsonian by chance, at this fortunate moment, and steams the dying patient into life and activity at once; [*We did not say this.*—ED.] we must confess that we are *stumped* here, and are compelled for the first time, and we promise it shall be the last, to resort to the Lecturer’s own mode of reasoning to confute his very forcible imaginary arguments. *We* will then say also, there is a cholera patient who has unfortunately fallen into the hands of the Thomsonians, and a *caravan* of them has now surrounded him. One says, ah! this is a dreadful case; what shall be done, says another? Steam him! steam him!! one and all cry out in a most stentorian voice, that reaches even to the dark abodes of death. On to the fire the kettles go, and a general rustling for blankets now ensues, and the poor fellow is wrapped up like a mummy and hoisted over pot or steam tub, as the case may be. The unfortunate patient bears the intolerable suffocation for awhile—nature at length becomes exhausted, and life is fled—the head of the patient falls upon his shoulder, and his eyes are fixed in ghastly death; and this is the first discovery they make of the result of their remedy. All hands now drop him simultaneously, and scamper off as fast as they can, like frightened rats from a barn on fire. The poor fellow, thus left, of course tumbles

into the tub ; and, if he is not quite dead from steam, he is soon *scalded* to death.

After a good deal of such reasoning as the sample we have given in the above quotation, in praise of the steam practice, the Lecturer brings the whole sum and substance of the treatment of their patients, by the Thomsonians to this; He says:

“ If they find the patient cold, they heat him;

If feverish, they sweat him;

If vomiting, they clear out the offensive matter;

If weak, they strengthen him;

If cramped, they relax his muscles;

If obstructed, they remove the *obstructacles*;

[This word, which the Doctor appears to use as if he had copied it from our lectures, is one of his own coining. We never wrote it.—ED.]

And if hungry, they feed him.”

Are all these different situations of their patient, all to be relieved by *one plan of treatment*? The remedy, however, for the last condition of the patient, hunger, if no other, we should rather feel disposed to doubt, at least, from some of the samples we have seen of these Thomsonians; and we will give a case in point, to illustrate their ability for applying this remedy. One of them happening to pass through this county not very long since, introduced himself to a medical friend and acquaintance of ours; and proposed to sell him a little mutilated book, having the appearance of being handled in no very decent manner, for the round sum of twenty dollars. The physician not feeling much disposed to give so large a price for so small a book, at once refused. The Thomsonian, no ways disheartened, began to describe its great *worth* and *value*, went on a long rigmarole of *scientific jabber*, and ended at last with offering

his book for fifteen dollars. Meeting with the same success as before, he offered it again for ten dollars; and here he was again disappointed. Still not wishing to fail, he proposed to sell it for five dollars. Still he was unsuccessful. He resolved to make one last and powerful effort. He appealed to the *generosity* of the physician, related his distresses, and again offered his book for two dollars and a half. The physician, for the sake of charity, gave him some small amount, with the advice not to offer his book again for sale. The next news he heard of the Thomsonian, he was not very far off, lying *drunk* in the side of the road. Having applied the *steam* too freely, he *keeled up*. Whether the boiler bursted or not, we did not learn, but presume however, that he remained until the *obstructacles* were removed and the *offensive matter* cleared out.

But with regard to the plans of the regular physician's. If they find their patient *cold, feverish, vomiting, cramped, &c. &c.*, they endeavor to search out the *cause* which has produced this unhealthy condition of the system, and apply those *remedies*, which in their own judgment and by the experience of others, seem most proper and best calculated to *remove* this offending cause and restore the health of the patient—and, if they find him *hungry*, they advise him to labor for his bread—if unable to labor, they are always ready to feed him.

The lecturer goes on, in his remarks, by endeavoring to establish the idea that all diseases are *one and the same*, and therefore, that there is *one remedy* capable of curing all diseases, steam we presume he alludes to. [No such thing is in the lectures.—Ed.] To substantiate this position, he



has thought proper to refer us to the *various crimes* committed by the inmates of a prison as proceeding from one cause, the "*corruption of the human heart*," and says, "it is as easy for him (alluding to our Creator) to provide one *universal remedy* for the cure of the diseases of the body, as it is for the cure of the sin sick soul," meaning the blood of Christ. What an example of piety does he here set in making use of such remarks as these, in a controversial lecture. And has he not found out yet the great difference between the organized human system of *material matter*, and the immaterial soul? What a manifestation of consummate ignorance is here displayed! We believe as fully in the powers of the Almighty, as Dr. Curtis or any other man; and we believe too that he has the power to create a remedy, whose virtues would be fully competent for the cure of all diseases, to which the human system is liable. [This is all *we* said on the subject.—Ed.] But the question is, has such an individual remedy been created? We think not. Why? Because we now have among those already created, medicines which are capable of producing almost *every effect* on the human system that can be desired. The creation of all those remedies would therefore have been entirely unnecessary, if there existed *one single one*, which possessed all their virtues. We have emetics and cathartics, medicines which promote the flow of urine and the secretion of perspiration, medicines which cool the system and stimulate it, medicines which check pain, which compose the system, and make us sleep, medicines which will check the flow of blood, purify and heal the wounds of our flesh, and a host of others.—What more could we have asked of a bountiful

creator? The disease of death we expect not to relieve, even the blood of Christ has not exempted us from this dreadful disease.

But the Steam Doctors will tell you; we can cure all diseases. Nothing to do but to heat you when you is cold, sweat you, when you have fever, clear out the offensive matter, strengthen you when weak, relax your muscles when cramped, remove the *obstructacles*, and feed you when you is hungry, and all these different diseased conditions of the system flow from one precious cause, called KAKER, this is the source of all disease, like sin it is the source of all the varied crimes, and this kanker is to be removed from the system by steam and Lobelia and disease ceases. Just like the blood of Christ in removing sin from the heart, and crimes cease. Wonderful indeed! What a world of people we shall have after awhile; just let us have a few more steam doctors in the country, and there will be no chance for *dying*. Bless me! what an age we shall all live to be. What happy fellows! Oh! how delightful the idea, to think that we shall live as long as the old patriarchs, even Mathuselah himself.

We come to the second Lecture. At the very outset, in the very first sentence of this lecture, the gentleman has made a precious confession.—He says “the Botanic system of medical practice is altogether the fruit of *experience*.” Thus it is, that he endeavors to set up the few short years experience of one man and his deluded followers in opposition to ages and even centuries of experience that are past and gone; and this is the estimation in which he holds the *advantages* to be derived from the “progress, improvement and perfection of reason.” The very language of the fol-

lowing quotation is enough, if there was nothing else, to condemn this practice as rude, full of errors, superstitious and dangerous in the extreme. He says, "in his youth, the author of this system (Thomson) *providentially discovered* that a certain plant (the Lobelia) possessed the power to eject in a short time, with very little pain or inconvenience and with no evil consequences whatever, any foreign or morbid (I wonder where he found what *morbid* meant) [just where he found what *father*, mother, or son, means; viz: in the speech of his parents, and the populace about him, as well as in the English dictionaries—Ed.] matter from the human stomach," thus placing the whole system on the ground of *accident*, and the result of *luck* and on the same footing with the state of medical knowledge some four or five thousand years ago, and at the very same time urging it upon the people of the present civilized and enlightened age, in opposition to all experience and enlightened reason, as the only correct and safe principle of medical practice, what impudent presumption.

But the assertion which he has made, as to the discovery of Lobelia and its properties, is not true. [He did not assert that Dr. Thomson discovered the plant.—Ed.] The discovery of this plant was made long before the *fortunate birth* of Samuel Thomson, and its properties were well known.—When he asserts, then, that this plant is harmless in its consequences, he assumes a position contrary to truth, as established by positive facts. [These are mere assertions that Dr. Deloney has not proved and cannot prove.—Ed.]

Again: in his first lecture, he labors to prove that his system of practice, was the result of the *progress, improvement and perfection of reason*, as

operating on Samuel Thomson. In the first sentence of the second Lecture, he says that the Botanic system of practice is altogether the *fruit* of Samuel Thomsons' *experience*; and in the very next breath, he says it was the *providential discovery* of Samuel Thomson. [*It*—the emetic property of lobelia. The Doctor, notwithstanding his flourish about Latin and Greek, is so ignorant of grammar that he cannot perceive to what the pronouns refer.—ED.] What beautiful logic, how admirably consistent, a mere accident, the fruits of chance, yet in this accidental, hap-hazard, chance-work, how many of our fellow-citizens do we find, ready to risk their lives, plunging heedlessly and headlong into the most imminent dangers.

But to proceed. The Lecturer makes an attempt to give his *theoretical views* of the cause of disease and its cure, and then goes on to relate the great and good effects of steam in several cases, which *cases*, we believe from good reasons, *never occurred*: first, because he is vague and indefinite in the relation of every case; second, he neither gives the name or residence of the patient; third, he does not state who the physician was that attended these patients and failed in their efforts to cure. Thus leaving no clue by which the facts, which he presumes to relate, may be investigated and the truth of them ascertained; and fourth, the advocates of a *system* or *doctrine* which is so important to the welfare of the human family, and on the success of which they must feel a lively and excited interest, would not hesitate, yea would grasp with avidity, to lay before the public eye, every *tangible fact* that might tend to establish those doctrines. But such is not the case. We hear of the *wonders* which have been effected by these Thomsonians, in

the cure of disease, but they are always at a distance, and nobody else knows any thing about them, and so they go.

But to the theory, and it is only necessary to make a quotation of two short paragraphs, which contains the whole of it. He says, "whenever obstructions clog the operations of life at the fountain, the vital heat diminishes, the arteries and veins of the extremities become partially collapsed for want of heat in the blood to keep them expanded, a smaller quantity of blood than usual passes through them, and of course the vibrations must become more frequent to pass the whole through them [through the heart] in a given time. Another consequence is an undue accumulation of blood and heat in the heart, lungs and brain, which heat presently finds its way to the contracted skin where it accumulates, looks angry, and produces the peculiar effect denominated fever." So much for the the theory of disease, and now to the theory of the cure. "To expel this fever, we supply the fountain with *additional heat*, apply warmth and moisture to the surface to relax the pores, and then exercise to action the secretory vessels by means of *diffusible stimulants*, (I wonder what kind of heat he *supplies* the fountain with before he uses the *diffusible stimulants*.) [We did not say that we supply it with *any* kind "before;" that which we add is partly artificial, as heat in the teas, and partly natural, as produced by the action of the living principle on the stimulants.—Ed.] When all the proper evacuations from the pores of the surface; the stomach, &c. are effected, that is, when the *obstructions* are removed, the cause of fever is gone, the *arteries* and veins being warmed and expanded, the blood *returns* through them

(whoever heard of blood *returning* through the arteries) in its usual quantity, the digestive organs being relieved are enabled to resume their duty, there is no more occasion for fever, the man is well." Easier said than done we think. [To *return*, is to go again in the same path trod before; thus, a man goes out and returns home; and then he returns to the spot to which he first went; so the blood goes in the veins to the heart and returns by the surface, by the arteries, &c.—ED.]

In the first paragraph, where he has couched his theory of diseased action, he is contradictory and vague from beginning to end. Let us see. "When *obstructions* clog the operations of life at the *fountain*." What kind of *obstructions* does he here allude to? Will he inform us? And where does he conceive the *fountain of life* to be situated?—It cannot be in the heart, lungs or brain; for, says he in the latter part of the paragraph, "*an undue accumulation of blood and heat*" in these organs is the *mere consequence* of the *obstructions*, which *clog the operations of life* at the *fountain*. Then where shall we find this precious "*fountain*," which it seems, is so necessary and essential to be kept purified of the obstructions, of which he speaks.—Again, he says, "when obstructions clog the operations of life at the fountain, the *vital heat* *diminishes*," the arteries and veins become cold for *want of heat* in the *blood* to keep them *expanded*; and yet another consequence of these same *obstructions* is an undue accumulation of blood and heat in the heart, which finds its way to the extremities and causes fever. Again, he says, from these "*obstructions* which clog the operations of life," &c. a *smaller quantity* of blood than usual passes through the arteries and veins. Of course the vi-

brations must become more frequent to pass the whole through in a given time," whilst these same "*obstructions*" causes a *greater quantity of blood and heat than usual* around the heart, which blood finds its way in *greater quantities* through the artereal system to the surface and extremities, *distends* the vessels of the skin and produces heat ovre the whole body, which heat is denominated fever. Again, we repeat, so much for this theory of disease.

We will now proceed to examine his plan of *the cure of diseases*, and very little is necessary to be said, under this head. All diseases then he considers as an unit—all proceeding from the same cause, viz: "the obstructions which clog the operations of life at the fountain." [Not always at the fountain, Doctor. We said *when* they clog at the fountain; not they *always* do it at the fountain, &c.—ED.] Than this, he has given *no other cause* of diseased action; consequently according to his theory, all diseases must be *one* and the *same*.—Now, in the practice of the regular physician, they conceive it a most essential circumstance in the cure of diseases, to find out first, the seat and character of the disease, and the nature of particular organ or part of the system diseased, and this is one of the first and main points in the successful treatment of disease. But the Lecturer has left us entirely in the dark in this important point. In his theory of treatment, he has only told us, in general terms, that the "*obstructions which clog the operations of life at the fountain*," are the source or cause of all disease. He has not told us [we did tell him in the preceding paragraph—"should the stomach," &c. "The stoamach is the centre of sympathies."—*Hunter*.] where he conceives

the *fountain of life* to be seated, or which particular organ, if any one, he considers to be this *fountain*, nor has he informed us through what channel we may be enabled to direct our remedies so as to reach and remove those obstructions which so materially clog the operations of life. He has not told us even the *nature* of those *obstructions*, nor by what peculiar manner or agency they approach and operate on the human system, so as to clog so effectually all the healthy operations of life. How then does he expect us to remove a disease, unless we are fully acquainted with the peculiar character of that disease, in what part of the system it is located and the character of the organ diseased—whereby we may be enabled to understand the *proper plan* of treatment and the peculiar means which are best *adapted* to carry out this plan to a successful issue. But he leaps over entirely, all this important information which is so necessary for us to know in the removal of diseases, and is content to recommend means for the removal only of what is the mere effect of the *cause*; for says he, whenever obstructions clog the “operations of life at the fountain,” the *effect* of these *obstructions* “is an undue accumulation of *blood and heat* in the *heart, lungs and brain*, which [heat] presently finds its way to the contracted skin where it accumulates, looks angry and produces fever.”—And he says, to *expel* this *fever* (not the *cause*, mind you,) “we supply the fountain (here again we should like to know where and what the fountain is and how to supply it) with *additional heat*, apply warmth and moisture (meaning steam) to the surface to relax the pores,” &c. and thus he effects his cures: so whatever causes an effect, you have only to *increase* that cause to *remove* its effect.



[We said the cause was obstruction, and we increased the *fever*; but Dr. Deloney, *will* not or *cannot* understand English; he is too much wrapped up in Latin and Greek.—Ed.] Wonderful reasoning indeed! If then an undue accumulation of blood and *heat* in the heart, lungs and brain, finds its way to the skin and causes fever, you have only to increase this heat, to *remove the fever which it has caused*. If you would extinguish the burning flame you have only to add to it fresh fuel. If you would rest the jaded steed, you have only to apply the whip and spur.

We have followed our Lecturer, and pointed out the glaring inconsistencies through which he has travelled until our patience is wearied. We have gone through his unreasonable *reasoning* as regards the application of the progress, improvement and perfection of reason, with his system of practice, and we have pointed out his inconsistencies there. We have gone through his theory of disease and his cure, the ground work of his hopes and the fabric of his system—there we find him vague and erroneous without consistency and without principle—as the work of chance and accident, indistinct and confused, without foundation in truth or matter of fact. Consequently the whole superstructure tumbles to the ground, a mouldering monument of the *perfection* of human ignorance soon destined to pass into utter annihilation and oblivion. [Thus you reject sound medical philosophy, because you have not talent and education enough to understand the plain English in which it is conveyed.—Ed.]

We have perused the balance of the lecture. It contains nothing of importance—in good keeping however as regards matter and reasoning with

the former part—an attempted *eulogy* only on the great virtues of the system, and a list of imaginary cases in which its results were so glorious. Hollow vessels sound the loudest and this is all we can say in reply to the conclusion of the lecture.

We will now draw our remarks to a conclusion with only a few more observations. There are many of these Thomsonians who remind us of some disappointed physician, who, from want of talents and skill, fails of success with his patients, and looses his practice. Vexed at his fate, he is ready to grasp at any system of quackery by which he may impose on the credulity of the people and gratify a weak and grovelling ambition, rather than go to work and earn his bread by honest labor—of a simpleheaded lawyer, who, because he has not talents to support the dignity of his profession beyond the sphere of a district court, is ready to vilify and abuse his smarter brethren—of a disappointed politician, who, not having talents enough to raise him in the estimation of the people, or virtue and patriotism to sustain him, you find him shifting from one side to the other, eagerly seizing upon and advocating every new-fangled doctrine that is introduced into the country, in order that he may swim an hour or two on the current, and at last sink down disrespected and despised, a victim to his own folly.

From what reason or authority, we would ask, have these Thomsonians for assuming the name of “botanical” for their system of practice? Do they not rely as much or more in “steam” than any other means? and why not at once call it by its proper name “the steam system?” Do these men make use of a greater number of *botanical* or vegetable remedies than the medical profession. Let

us see. In the American Dispensatory of the regular physicians, we find *six or eight hundred* or more of botanical remedies, all exercising a specific action, and among them the famous lobelia, while the Thomsonians it appears only makes use of some *two or three dozen?* [Oh no, Dr. Deloney. They all resolve themselves into the famous lobelia, the remedy of remedies."]—Ed.] Which system then is most entitled to the name of *botanic?*—that which has assumed it without reasonable ground or authority, or that which neither has nor wishes to do so? Was it for the purpose of adding popularity to their system by a name which might be calculated to induce a belief that they excluded from their system the use of all *mineral remedies*, that they were thus induced to assume the name of "*botanic?*"—and is the name and effect of *mineral medicine* so odious to the feelings and dangerous in their operations on the human system as to frighten these Thomsonians into convulsions at the very sound of their name? Are they so simple as not to believe that our beneficent Creator could provide as good and effectual remedies for the cure of disease, in the bowels of the earth, as on its surface, which would operate as beneficially and with as little danger as even the renowned lobelia itself! Nothing but sheer ignorance and perfect stupidity could induce a belief otherwise than this.

Let us then proceed to examine into the virtues of some of these mineral remedies, which appear so frightful to these Thomsonians. First then we will name the much abused and despised article called Calomel. And what of calomel. In the first place, it will purge your stomach and bowels of all "obstructions" and [There must be some

misprint here; but, as we know not what the Doctor wrote, we dare not supply what appears to us to be wanted.—ED.] rations of Copper, of Antimony, of Tin, of Lead, acrid collections, and that effectually and salutary—it will control the excited and unequal action of the system and produce a general equilibrium in all the secretions—it will “open the pores of the skin” and remove fever—it will give strength and tone to the general system—it will control the inordinate action of the liver, and regulate the secretion of bile—it will curb and reduce the inflammatory action in the circulating system, and it will stimulate this same system and add impetus to its circulation—it will promote digestion, because it has the power of removing indigestion—in short, it has the power of curing more diseases than one half of the whole list of *botanic remedies* all put together, with *lobelia and steam* to help them. We have many other superior remedies of the mineral kingdom; but it will assume too much time and space to describe their virtues, there are various preparations of Iron, of Silver, and a host of others, amounting in all to more than three hundred mineral remedies; and then there are remedies of the *animal kingdom*. What physician can be found who would consent to exclude from his practice the use of Spanish flies, musk or even the simple article of hogs lard? And yet says these Thomsonsians, all these excellent remedies of the mineral and animal kingdoms, the blessings of a providential creation, are nothing but so many *poisons* and *unfit* for the uses of man. What an attempted reproach on the wisdom of our heavenly Benefactor, is this bold audacity and presumption in a frail and deluded set of men, the mere creatures of a breath!

But to conclude, and we trust it will not be thought presumption in us to do so by an admonition to our fellow-citizens to beware how they suffer themselves *tinkered* upon by these botanic system quacks. Dangers unperceived follow their daily footsteps, and lurk around them wherever they move. They are deceived and deluded into error, and they will rush headlong and thoughtlessly into their experiments and practice on a system or machinery the delicate construction and principles of which they know nothing about.— Ask yourselves this simple question, why cannot I make a watch? The answer is plain; because you have not studied or investigated the principles, organization and structure of a watch. Suppose the machinery of this watch becomes deranged and it will not keep the regular time, why can't your repair it and restore its regular action? Because you know nothing about the principles on which it is constructed. You cannot even mend a *single broken wheel*. How much more intricate and delicate then is the machinery of man, and how much more incapable we are and what more responsibility we ought to feel, when we approach the bedside of a fellow being, in whom the functions of life are deranged, to repair those derangements, when on our *ability* and *skill* to do so, depends his precious life.

We rejoice that the days of witchcraft and conjuration, have long since passed by, and the days of *quackery* will soon follow in their wake. Although it may now be in the sunshine of its glory, its triumph is but momentary. Soon it will, with all its evil consequences, sink quietly down to the shades of night to be remembered no more.

EDWARD DELONY.

Talbotton, Ga. April 20, 1835.

On a careful perusal, we thought the foregoing "remarks" scarcely worthy of a serious answer.— We considered them evidently the production of an ignorant, prejudiced and reckless declaimer, incapable of making correct observations, using sound logic, or writing plain English. We could discover in them, little else than misunderstanding and misquotation of our lectures, baseless reasoning and mere declamation, consisting of proofless assertions against the new practice and its friends, and in favor of the old and its advocates; mere "hollow vessels that sound the loudest." At the request, however of several distinguished gentlemen in Georgia, in whose judgment we had reason to confide, and their intimation that these "hollow vessels" and their discharge of mere powder, if not exposed in their true character, might pass, with many, for evidences of well charged cannon and deadly shots; we sent to the Federal Union the following reply.—Ed.

#### FOR THE FEDERAL UNION.

*Dr. Edward Deloney:*

SIR—Permit me, in my turn, to make a few remarks on those from your pen, published in the Georgia Federal Union of May 26. I address you, sir, instead of the Editor or the public, because I wish continually to realize your presence, in order to deter me from using any epithets, or unfair modes of reasoning, which I would not use were you sitting by my side. As I said, publicly, in the Baltimore Lyceum, so say I now; "if any gentleman, friend or foe, will point out and prove a single error in the positions advanced in my lectures, I will thank him for the correction. Truth

is my object; I care not from what source it comes." You seem to write as though I were your enemy, disposed to find fault with, and abuse you; and hence you treat me with such phrases as "learned lecturer," "champion of *steam*," &c. which I consider rather unpolite. I neither professed to be very learned, nor to stand up, as the Goliath, to fight alone, all the battles of the Thomsonian army. I was respectfully requested by "the Convention," to say what I did in the first lecture, and by the Baltimore Lyceum to say what I did in the second. In the former, I was left to my choice of subjects; in the latter, the question, "Is the Thomsonian System of Medical Practice worthy of encouragement?" was proposed, by the Lyceum, for my discussion. I trust this explanation will subtract some of the odium of the "presumption" and "learning" and "ignorance" with which you have favored me. You will please to take notice that I did not call physicians by any reproachful term, (see note, page 105,) nor do I approve of such conduct in Dr. Thomson or any one else. You will not, therefore, construe my neglecting to notice such expressions or epithets as the above, used by yourself or others; or to use them of others in my turn, into an admission that they are properly used against me or others.

The answer to your first paragraph, I may safely leave in the hands of "Equity," against whom you have offended, noticing only what you have directed against the common cause. You say that, in penning an article against it for publication, you are "bestowing on that subject, [the Botanic System,] far more attention than it merits."—Now, sir, if this system is what, in the sequel of your remarks, you strive to make it, a system of

“deception, devastation and death,” not only to the people of an isolated spot, but to those of the whole length and breadth of these United States, I see not with what propriety you can treat it so lightly. It is generally considered noble for any man to make himself the instrument of saving the life of a single fellow mortal; how much more noble to save a whole community! Is there so “little importance” attached to what you call a system of “*havoc and desolation*,” that you hesitate about the propriety of making a single effort to stop such fearful ravages? If I could think, as you appear to do, “that Thomsonism is doing more mischief than all the diseases of the land united,” I should say that its arrest and suppression were objects worthy of the united exertions of all the physicians in America—yes, in the civilized world; and that, at their own expense and during their natural lives. That dreadful scourge the cholera, enlisted the mental and physical exertions of all the benevolent physicians whose regions it visited, in every part of the globe. Who can read the interesting essays of Kirk, Broussais, Boisseau, Smith, the Massachusetts Medical Society, Dr. Brown of Sunderland, and others, without admiring the zeal and philanthropy of the authors, as well as deploring the ravages of the pestilence which so haughtily defied so large a portion of their efforts! Is a single physician in a remote part of an American State, so far elevated above the common demands of suffering humanity, that he cannot even stoop to pen a paragraph for a newspaper, for the purpose of arresting a scourge which many of his brethren have pronounced “more to be dreaded than the cholera,” on account of the traces of “horrid devastation” which it every where “leaves



ere it has commenced?" (See Med. and Surg. Jour., vol. 11, page 214.) Surely, sir, if "enlightened society wails its momentary triumph," the physicians who are or ought to be the guardians of our health, should make every laudable effort to suppress it.

You say, "the system has no foundation in truth or common sense, and is contrary to all enlightened reason." Dr. B. Waterhouse whose reason is not a little enlightened, says, "I should place Samuel Thomson among the reformers of the healing art." (T. R., vol. 3, page 154.) That "he," Thomson, "acquired his knowledge of the *hitherto unknown virtues* of certain plants, by *experiment*, first *on himself*, and then on those around him. In the course of twenty or thirty years, he arranged his experimental knowledge into a *system*, as did the *Father of Physic* before him." (T. R., vol. 1, page 109.) Dr. W., continues, "It is not beneath the dignity of any physician, divine or philosopher, to inquire into the truth of a series of experiments published with so much confidence, and purporting to be for the benefit of mankind." (ib.) "When learned doctors disagree, who shall decide? We answer, experience; whether through Samuel Thomson or Manassah Cutler, matters not, though neither of them was bred to physie." (T. R., vol. 1, page 384.) The public *experience*, then, must judge between you and Dr. W., as it certainly will do, by the effects of exercising the different modes and means of practice. Be not displeased if I prefer to yours, the opinion of the venerable and learned Dr. Waterhouse. Surely, having been many years lecturer on the Theory and Practice of Physic, in the oldest university in the United States, his opin-

ion is worthy of respect. You say again, "in vain has medical genius plodded the wearisome, intricate and rugged path of medical science," &c. I answer, yes, sir, and this was proved in the latter part of my last lecture, by quotations from Dr. Abercrombie and others, and arguments founded on them and other matters of fact, which you thought it convenient to style "nothing of importance," and "hollow vessels," that "sound the loudest," as "all you can say in reply" to them. Were, indeed, the startling assertions of Abercrombie, that "those who have had the most extensive opportunities of observation, will be the first to acknowledge that your pretended experience must, in general, sink into analogy, and even your analogy too often into conjecture;" that, "almost the only resource of medicine, is the art of conjecturing;" of D'Alembert, that a physician at a patient's bed side, resembles a blind man armed with a club," and "striking at random, not knowing whether he shall kill the disease or the patient?" of others, that is "the science of guessing" "learned quackery," &c.\* I say, were these startling assertions of the very heads of the principal medical schools in the world, which, if true, completely overset all "your pretended experience" in relation to the nature and character of disease, unworthy of even a passing notice? Add to this the sweeping declaration of Dr. Abercrom-

---

\* "I am indeed so disgusted with *learned quackery*," says Dr. Waterhouse to Dr. Mitchell, (T. R., vol. 1, page 104,) "that I take some interest in honest, humane, and strong-minded empiricism. *It has done more for our art, in all ages and countries, than all the universities since the days of Charlemagne.*" "Where, for goodness' sake, did Hippocrates study? \* \* He read diligently and sagaciously the great book of nature, as Thomson has, instead of the little books of man," [ib.]

bie; "the action of external agents on the body, demands our attention in two respects, as causes of disease and as remedies; *in both which respects their action is fraught with the highest degree of uncertainty,*" and what a melancholy picture have we, of the vanity of all your three thousand years experience!\* What do you think of this testimony, Dr. Deloney? Dared you not touch even the handle of this broad axe laid at the very root of your boasted system? Again, was not all the medical testimony I adduced in favor of steam and our *materia medica*, their effects on paralysis, &c., and the difficulty and even impossibility of getting a correct knowledge of the names and descriptions of disease, their worthlessness, if you could, &c. worthy of a single paragraph? Is all you can say in reply to them, they are "hollow vessels," that "sound the loudest?" Surely this is treating your venerable instructors with quite as little respect as I have ever treated that thing of no feeling, called "three thousand years of medical experience." But, sir, "silence" on points which, though they embrace almost the whole "subject matter" of dispute between us, was and will be your "better policy." Here we might confidently rest the whole

---

\* Dr. Lieuteaud, in his *Synopsis of Medical Practice*, says, page first, the genuine nature of fever, lies in great obscurity; \* \* inasmuch that it is difficult to disentangle certainty from uncertainty, useful from trivial. Hence many of no mean rank have doubted whether it would not be *better to give up the undertaking*, and confine themselves to new observations, out of which, when well investigated and arranged, there might be produced a *sounder theory*. I will leave this to the more learned, and will only candidly and briefly publish what I have collected from a practice of thirty years." The very thing that Thomson thought and did, for which he was scandalized and abused without measure, while referring to the learning and medical accumen of Dr. Lieuteaud, his translator says, "*I am not worthy to hold a candle to him!!!*"

argument against the boasted antiquity and consequent superiority of your practice, as founded on an experience of three thousand years; but, as you insist on a multitude of theories, diseases and specific remedies, we will follow you out.

If, then, your "enlightened society" includes only persons ignorant of facts, and whose interests oppose its diffusion, I doubt not *that* society bewails the triumph" of the Botanic practice. But, if enlightened society means persons who are independent in principle, acquainted with facts, and lovers of truth, I would respectfully ask proof of your assertion. (See Dr. Waterhouse's opinion on this subject, T. R., vol. 3, page 104-5.)

You appear to think that "Equity" is "desirous for this subject to be *dubbed with legislative authority.*" I do not so understand him. To give any class of men exclusive authority to rights and privileges of which others are equally worthy, is not *equity*; therefore that gentleman cannot ask such a grant. The Thomsonians of Georgia, if they are like those of other places, ask only permission to do that which they prove themselves as able to do, as any other men are. All who prove themselves equally skilful in any art or profession, ought to be permitted to exercise it on the same terms. The object of medical science is to preserve and restore to health; or, in other words, to prevent and cure disease. The Thomsonians claim the privilege of exercising, untrammelled, the healing art, on the ground that they can do it as successfully as their opponents. Let the honest legislators of Georgia compare the results of these two kinds of practice, and if the Botanists substantiate their claim, grant it; if not, refuse it. I guarantee that "Equity," whether literal or figurative,

shall ask no more. For a further consideration of this subject of medical jurisprudence, I refer you to my answer to Dr. Williams, of the Maryland Legislature, *sent* to the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, *where*, or in the *Thomsonian Recorder*, it will shortly be published; simply remarking here, that the "law-makers of Georgia" will be compelled, soon or late, to *license* whatever their masters, *the people*, approve.

To your assertion that the Thomsonian System of Practice, "embraces quackery in its full perfection," I oppose that of the venerable Dr. Waterhouse, (T. R. vol. 3, page 154,) "Paracelsus first introduced mercury, antimony, and opium into the *materia medica*. But he was arrogant, vain and profligate; he studied mystery and wrapped up his knowledge in terms of his own invention, so as to keep it confined. to himself and a few chosen followers. The very reverse of Thomson who performs numberless cures, and makes no secret of the means. The cant phrase of 'Quack' *belongs* to the learned Paracelsus, but not to the mystery-hating Thomson, who considers mystery and roguery offsprings of the same man of sin, the old father of lies and deception." Who shall decide between you and the learned professor of the theory and practice of physic? I answer *experience*! As to the "havoc and desolation" which you say is our motto, I am acquainted with no Thomsonian who wears it.—I fear you have indulged a little in hyperbole in this matter. We do, indeed, make wonderful havoc with lobelia, cayenne, composition, bitters, No. 6, &c. &c. &c., aye, and with what you call "incurable diseases," too. But we are ready at all times to compare the "havoc-and desolation" produced by the two systems, on human life and health, wherever and by whomsoever applied.

When you come to the "subject matter of the lectures," you labor to show that I had endeavored to prove, in the first place, that the Thomsonian System is the result of the improved and perfected experience of mankind in general; whereas, all my object in that part of the lecture, was to show the impropriety in condemning or approving any proposition, system, or any thing else, till we have a thorough and accurate knowledge of it. The anecdote of the legal process in Trenton, teaches us to be cautious, even when we *think* we know all about the matter; and the whole lecture, so far as it treated on the origin, nature, progressive improvement, and perfection of reason, was intended to divest the minds of my hearers of prejudice, open them to conviction, and show them how to distinguish truth and reason, from falsehood and sophistry, in what might be presented for their consideration, by myself or others. I am happy to learn that, both in their delivery and their publication, this object has been attained in numerous instances. A gentleman in *Georgia*, whose letter indicates that he is not deficient in talent or learning, says "your lectures have done much to *soften* the *prejudices*, and *conciliate* the *favor* of many of the more *intelligent* portions of community."—Another of the *same State*, intimates that those lectures were the first writings on the subject, to which he listened with respect himself, or could fasten the attention of another gentleman for talents and influence "second to none in the State." Testimonies from other quarters are too numerous to be mentioned here.

"Reason is an improvable faculty, and the longer it is exercised in the investigation of any subject, the nearer to truth that investigation must

lead us." I grant it, in general, if used with the right means and in the right manner; but, sir, may we not reason and investigate on wrong premises? Suppose the most scientific philosopher of the present age, were to say, "because the alchymists who first supposed that all metals might be turned into gold, reasoned and experimented, for hundreds of years, to prove their supposition true; therefore, if they had continued to reason and experiment in the same way, they would finally have found the gold; and that the story of the Europeans who first visited South America, about the untutored savages having abundance of that precious metal suspended to their ears and noses, must have been a tale of fancy, because those barbarians did not know how to discover it scientifically, what would you think of such reasoning? But I need not suppose a case—you have given me several striking examples. Take the following from paragraph twentieth. You begin to criticise before you have attentively read the paragraph in which I "couched my theory of diseased action." Hence, you *quote* wrong, and then reason on your wrong quotations, which is the cause of all the inconsistency you find in your conclusions. You say, "these obstructions cause a *greater quantity* of blood and heat, than usual, around the heart, which *blood* finds its way in greater quantities," &c. In the Recorder whence the article was copied, (I have not the Federal Union by me,) you will find it printed as I wrote it, "which *heat* finds its way," &c. A due attention to this expression, and some others, would have saved you the trouble and exposure of a blundering criticism upon it. A moment's reflection might have convinced you also, that it would have been improper in me to teach all the

minutiæ of the science in a single lecture, before a mixed audience, when I had been invited only to present a general view of the subject. Thus you might have saved yourself the trouble of asking so many questions, and the mortification of finding yourself still ignorant, where plainer men than yourself, who attended to the text, had found no difficulty in comprehending the meaning. If, however, you insist on being thus minutely instructed, come to the Richmond Infirmary, and you shall be taught both the Theory and Practice.

In paragraph fifth, you intimate that "the impurities and rubbish" of past investigations and researches, "have been lopped off," and "the truths sifted from the chaff and treasured up in sacred keeping." Why then did Hobbes, the philosopher, "wish that all the books in the world were embarked in one ship, and that he might be permitted to bore a hole in the bottom?" Why did Locke say that "the Disquisitions and Treatises with which our libraries are filled, are often merely the husks and shells of knowledge—it *were to be wished* that some literary analysts *should select* [you say they are "sifted"] all the facts, recipes and prescriptions, useful to man, and condense them into a *portable volume*." What follows would be pretty enough, *if it were correct*.

In paragraph sixth, you say, "men frequently reason wrongfully from wrong impressions," as I have just proved that you did from the *impression* that I had sent the *blood* to the surface instead of the *heat*, and that I attempted, by the exhibition of the origin, nature, progressive improvement and perfection of reason, to prove that Thomson's System was the result of general and misguided experience, instead of his own individual; founded,



not on specious hypothesis, but on unprejudiced and careful observation of unquestionable matters of fact. I believe that you committed these and other similar errors, partly in consequence of reading with a greater anxiety to *answer* and *refute*, than to *think* and *profit*. You make many *bold assertions* which you may find it difficult to prove.— You say, “we find Thomson and *his practice*, in *his* primitive and unenlightened condition, with no guide but chance, no reason but instinct, drawing *their own* conclusions in the dark, crude, erroneous, haphazard, and at a venture, just as the rude imagination may suggest.” [Thomson’s practice drawing conclusions! Is the practice as well as the author, intelligent? but,] can you be serious? Has Thomson, whom Dr. Waterhouse pronounces “equal to John Hunter, with (had he possessed the same advantages,) a wider range of thought;” “who read diligently and sagaciously the great book of nature, instead of the little books of man;” has this man “no reason but instinct,” not reason at all, no *experience* or literary attainment, “no *guide but chance?*”

Again, you say, “he comes forward with a theory as old as the hills.” Do you allude to that of Hippocrates, that “nature is heat?”—and “fever a friend!” Very well so far, but did this “Father of Physic” agree with Thomson, that “most fevers may be cured in a few hours,” or “two days at the farthest?” or did he *invent* the *famous system* of odd day “courses” for fevers to “run,” at their pleasure? Did Hippocrates steam, puke, and “drench with cold water,” his fever patients? Why does Dr. Waterhouse, who knows all the “theories” that are as “old as the hills,” say that Dr. Thomson is “a reformer of the healing art,”

if the reformation consisted only in reviving one of those "old theories?" a theory, too, that is "dangerous, ridiculous and nonsensical?" I fear, Doctor, that you use adjectives more freely than carefully.

You say, "surely the lecturer could not have presumed to speak of the progress and improvement of reason, as having attained to perfection during the natural life of one single individual, in the person of Samuel Thomson," &c. Surely I *have* the presumption to say that a *single reason* for a *single conclusion*, may have its *origin, progress* and *perfection* in a *single second*. Age after age of philosophers asserted, reasoned, concluded and still believe, that "the earth stands on a great turtle," but a single observation of a single individual, proved that reasoning false, and corrected the error. But according to your reasoning, the Chinese, like the alchymists, have only to reason on, every year bringing them nearer and nearer, till they will finally arrive at *perfection*? Do you not perceive, that "the progress and perfection of our reasoning" depends, on our experimenting, not in accordance with any preconceived theories, but with our minds entirely untrammelled by *any theory*, free to observe and account for, things *as we find them*?—Such was the experience of Thomson—such is that of all congenial spirits. You *say* that Lobelia, Cayenne, steam &c. in the hands of Thomsonians, are destructive to human life. We use them freely, and are speedily cured of disease. We prefer our experience of an hour, to your theory of twenty years. We are therefore better qualified "to lay down rules for your instruction," (in this matter) than you are "to guide our experience."

You make a great parade about the importance

of Latin and Greek. When you prove that the ancients understood the true nature of disease, and were more able than the moderns, to control it in any one form; or that *you now* practise or believe as they did, I also, will allow those languages some importance. But, please to tell me, what other nation imitates the example of the English, in “ couching their theory” of disease, and their materia medica in the terms of Greek and Latin, and a hundred barbarous dialects? Surely not the French, nor the German, the principal foreign lights in the still dark horizon of the medical world. When we find the knowledge of the languages of other nations, and the errors in theory and mischiefs in practice recorded therein, equal to that of the true causes and proper modes of curing disease in our own, we will pay more attention to that subject. We are thankful for Hebrew and Greek and Latin scholars to make translations, &c.; but we do say, that these are not indispensable in the ordinary business of life. A gentleman just now told me, that some time ago his child was attacked with croup, and so likely to die, that he thought it useless to send some miles for a doctor; so, though an enemy to the practice, he called in his Botanic neighbor from the next door, and in a few hours the child was as well as usual. He prescribed neither Latin nor Greek.— This short *experience* overcame the *deep rooted medical reasoning* of many years, and he has since cured, without losing one, fourteen cases of measles in his own family. Such circumstances as these are making Thomsonians every day, in spite of all your reasonings and warnings to the contrary. These men too, *will take and give* the medicines, in spite of all your law-makers, laws *and five hun-*

*dred dollar fines*, imposed to prevent freemen from eating and drinking what they please, and selling to their neighbors any articles of medicine, or rendering any personal services desired. "Did Dr. Thomson know," say you, "that there was such a thing as medicine before he heard some person say so?" As well as he did that there was such a thing as food, I presume. Names of things, in English as in all other languages, are applied as fast as the things themselves are discovered or invented. Thomson does not call men "*learned fools*," for translating books of medicine or divinity from Greek or Latin into English; but for maintaining that a knowledge of those languages must necessarily make them superior physicians, when the most illiterate Thomsonians actually excel them every day; and for reasoning so stupidly as they do, on the ground that they who search longest after a thing must necessarily be the first to find it.

You say that "Thomson or the first physician in the world, might see the peculiar action of any agent on the human system, but they know not the *mode of operation* by which these effects are produced." To this I answer, that even the most scientific of the most modern schools, have not moved a single step farther. Dr. Abercrombie, of the Edinburgh school, says, "*why* one medicine acts upon the stomach, another on the bowels, a third on the kidneys, a fourth on the skin, we [physicians] have not the smallest conception; we know *only the* uniformity of the facts."—(Intel. Pow. pa. 23.) To this I will add, that if Thomsonians had no surer means of producing emesis than antimony or tartar, of exciting catharsis than *sub. muri. hydrarg.* [calomel] and *ol. ricini*, [caster oil,] of

promoting the renal secretion, than potash, nitre, squill, colchicum, &c., or of ensuring perspiration than nitre, cantharides, &c., they would richly deserve to be fined *five hundred dollars* for every failure in their professed attempts to produce any one of these effects. The learned editors of the United States' Dispensatory do not appear to be any wiser than Dr. Abercrombie. Of your very "Samson," (as Dr. Rush called it) mercury, which may answer to the Thomsonian steam, cayenne and lobelia united, they honestly confess, (pages 345 and '6,) "Of the *modus operandi* of mercury, we can say nothing further than that it *seems* to act [we cannot be sure of it,] through the medium of the circulation, and that it possesses a peculiar [we know not what kind of] alterative power over the vital functions, which enables it, in many cases, [not a majority,] to subvert diseased actions by substituting its own in their place." Well would it be for the human race, if the cases in which it substitutes its own specific action for that of the disease, were far fewer than they are.—What brazen impudence, to *pretend* to know the "mode of operation" of your medicines, with all this evidence against you. The way it subverts diseased actions is, in my opinion, pretty well described in the Toxicology, where "it is contemplated *only* as a source of disease." (Good l. p. 80 and 78-9.) There, it is said that those who get much of it into their systems, "drag out a miserable existence, in extreme debility and emaciation, with stiff incurvated limbs, and total loss of teeth and appetite, till death, with a *friendly stroke*, puts a period to their sufferings." This, I humbly conceive, is a pretty correct description of the *general modus operandi* of mercury on the human system,

when left to "its peculiar action;" and I believe that one who understands nothing but English or French, can observe it as accurately, as he who can read Horace and Homer in the original.

You ask, paragraph eighth, "what the physicians done for sure and safe remedies, before Dr. Thomson was born?" I answer, they "*did without them*," as most of them do still. You say that our remedies "all settle down into the famous Lobelia, the remedy of remedies," notwithstanding I had told you that Dr. Thomson had described more than seventy different articles, and given us rules for the discovery of as many more as we please. And here I am bold to say, that more scientific, therapeutic principles "to guide our research after remedies" such as we need, than those of Samuel Thomson, "for the benefit of others," were never disclosed by any lecturer on the materia medica, since the world began. On the subject of Lobelia Inflata being poison, or of its medical qualities being known to the faculty before Thomson taught them, I am ready to break a lance with you at any time; meanwhile, as you have *asserted* both, I challenge you to prove either. An article in the Thomsonian Recorder, page 3 to 8, 3d volume, may aid you a little in this research. In more than a thousand "experiments" with it, I have never known it to produce a single "*drastic*" effect. Yet you say it is *among the most violent drastic and deleterious poisons* in the whole *materia medica*, or of which the vegetable kingdom can boast. I know not how you can prove that there is a shade of truth in this assertion, unless you show that *you have placed it in your wallet*, ~~among~~ among your colchicums, your savins, your croton oils, &c. &c.

In paragraph ninth, you have represented me as saying that the cholera patient, so alphabetically treated by the Doctors, was cured by Thomsonians. I said no such thing, as you will readily perceive by a re-perusal. If you ever knew a patient to be treated by Thomsonians as described in the latter part of this paragraph, you will oblige me by giving the name and residence of the practitioners and patient, and I assure you the former shall, if found guilty, be debarred from all the privileges of the society. In paragraph eighth, you accuse me of inconsistency in using the phrases "all diseases" and "safe remedies," when I had intimated that all forms of disease have a common origin, and are "to be relieved by one plan of treatment." To this, I reply, that I used these terms before my audience out of courtesy to their customary modes of thinking and speaking; that it might require no effort in them to understand me. But I now tell you that all forms of disease, proceed from obstructions, and the loss of vital heat, (which I believe, is always an effect of obstructions) and are to be cured by the same plan of treatment, viz: to raise the heat, relax the affected parts, throw out the *obstacles* (not *obstructions*, as you have misquoted it,) and tone up the system. I challenge you, and all the learned physicians in the universe, to give a more rational, philosophical or correct theory of disease, or of the true plan of treatment. What and of how many kinds are these obstacles to the healthy action of the vital power, and how they are to be removed, are subjects which shall be made clear to you, when you come to the Infirmary for instruction.

In answer to your twelfth paragraph, I observe

that, according to your own account, "the regular physicians" only "*endeavor* to search out the cause," and to apply the remedies that *seem* most proper and best calculated to remove "this offending cause," &c. What, therefore, you only "*endeavor*" to do, the Thomsonians actually accomplish. We well know the cause of "all diseases," and we have "remedies" that are *exceedingly*, if not "the most proper" to remove them. We fear no comparison with the wisest of the regular faculty on *these* subjects, though in anatomy and physiology, and acquaintance with the fluctuations of medical opinions and practices, we readily yield them the palm.

Do you seriously intimate, in paragraph thirteenth, that I "allude to steam," as the one principal remedy for "all diseases?" You charge me with impiety and consummate ignorance, for "comparing things temporal with things spiritual," seeming to forget that the parables and similes in the New Testament, by the Divine Founder and and his inspired followers, are almost all of the same character. Does the acknowledged "difference between the human system and the immaterial soul," subject the Saviour of the world to the charge of exhibiting "impiety or consummate ignorance," in his comparisons? If so, I am guilty. You object to a universal remedy, on the ground that it would render useless those which you deem specific; and say "you have remedies which are capable of producing on the system, *almost every effect* that can be desired." I ask, what is the reason then that you do not use them, and cure those diseases? Old age is not disease; it is "wearing out." Now as the period of this wearing of the machine, is fixed at one hundred and twenty



years, we never can attain to the "age of Mathusalem."

In paragraph fifteenth, you first exhibit a melancholy want of either ability or inclination to understand English, however much you may know of Latin and Greek. You say, I "made a precious confession that the Botanic System of medical practice is altogether the fruit of experience."—And so I still say, just as the finding of gold was, in South America and Mexico. Samuel Thomson is little more indebted to the boasted "wisdom and experience" of the Medical Schools, (except that their errors, blunders and "*havoc and desolation*," taught him to beware of them,) than the native Indians of America were to the alchymists of Europe for the discovery of gold and silver. "Thus," you say, "it is, that I endeavor to set up the few short years experience of one man and his deluded followers, in opposition to ages, and even centuries of experience that are passed." So I do. The momentary experience of the Virginia servant, who found a wedge of gold on his master's plantation, not even "by the guide of" geologic "principles," but when in pursuit of the cows, was worth more, so far as their prime object of obtaining gold was concerned, than the "ages of experience" of all the alchymists that ever lived. "Thus it is," that Hervey when he discovered the circulation of the blood, put the experience of that moment against that of all the physicians in the world before him. Thus it is, that the discoverers and inventors of any thing not known before their time, set the moment's experience of that discovery against the united experience of all their predecessors, and they boldly "set up" that short experience, in defiance of all other, just as you, sir, "en-

deavor to set up the few short years of your own experience," against that of all your venerable instructors of ancient and modern times, in *pretending* to know the *modus operandi* of your poisonous drugs, when they all declare they "know nothing" about it, and when you pretend to practise medicine on a scientific, beautiful, consistent, harmonious and adequate system, when those venerable and learned professors assure you, that all the experience of past ages can say of it is, that "almost its only resource is the art of conjecture." They call it very appropriately, the "science of guessing," of "striking in the dark," "learned quackery," "a temple unroofed and cracked at the foundation," &c. &c.; and Lord Bacon says, that "the progress of [the] reason" employed in *its* cultivation and improvement, was "in a circle, not in progression." Now, if the most enlightened professors of the Botanic School, were to speak so contemptuously of their science, I should almost doubt its accuracy, even though it seemed to agree with my own experience. But, sir, as you seem to think it no harm to doubt the existence of *Thomson's* discoveries and improvements, so you will not think hard of me, if I suspend my admission of *yours*, till I see the proof. If "the progress, improvement and perfection of reason," *in yourself*, has led to the discovery and perfection of a system of medical practice, and to a knowledge of the "*modus operandi*" of its remedies of which all its most renowned cultivators hitherto, confess themselves ignorant, be not angry with me for saying that it is possible for Samuel Thomson to have discovered something of which the same gentlemen were ignorant. It appears to me, Doctor, that in all your reasonings, you look only on one side,

and that even then, you let your imagination describe, before your judgment has measured. Thus, you remind me of the framer of that famous rule in Grammar, which says "Two or more nouns in the singular number, joined by one or more copulative conjunctions, must have plural verbs, nouns and pronouns to agree with them." A sweeping rule to be sure; but when we apply it in practice, we find it adapted to the use *only* of the single particle "*and*," and that even to this application, there are many exceptions; as, "every man and woman *was* taken," that scholar and critic *has* written solecisms; every form and color *has* its peculiar advantages, &c. &c. In paragraph sixteenth, you quote my "assertion," that Lobelia is harmless, and say "it is not true." Will you give me the "positive facts," on the evidence of which you charge me with error? You make me say, Thomson discovered "this plant" Lobelia, whereas, I only said he discovered *its value in medicine*. In paragraph seventeenth, you undertake to prove that a providential observation is not a part of a man's experience. I do not envy you the "beautiful and admirably consistent logic" and philology, thus exhibited. I suppose, then, if you were to be severely poisoned, by thoughtlessly chewing the twigs of a plant with whose properties you were unacquainted, and your friend who knew nothing of your misfortune, should ask you if he might eat the same twigs with impunity, you would answer; "I cannot advise you; I have *no experience* in the matter; all my knowledge is *mere hap-hazard chance-work*!" Deliver me from such logic.

Pardon me, Doctor: I would not trouble you about your "literary attainments," (rather exhibitions,)

had you given me any thing else to do. But, when all you have to say, "with regard to the plans of the regular physicians," is, that when they find their patient sick, "they *endeavor* to search out the cause which has produced this unhealthy condition of the system, and apply those *remedies* which, in their own judgment [guessing] and the experience [empiricism] of others, *seem* most proper and best *calculated* to remove this offending cause, and restore the health of the patient."\* And all you can do towards answering my arguments in favor of the Botanic practice, is, first, to misunderstand; second, to misquote; third, to misrepresent them; and then, fourthly, to turn, as the printer would say, "into pi," (one common jumble,) these misunderstandings, misquotations, and misrepresentations, by a sort of one-sided blind logic, for your skill in which no thinking man can envy you. I hope you will excuse me for taking notice of *such things as I find, instead of* such as I want.

In paragraph eighteenth, you say, I give my "theoretical views" of the causes of disease and its cure. I assure you, sir, that *not one* of those views was taken upon trust, no, not even from Samuel Thomson, (who, you would have the public believe, is our dictator,) but from reflection on my own personal observations and demonstra-

---

\*Any person, the most untutored, can "*endeavor*" to find out the cause of a symptom of disease, and apply "the remedies that *seem* to him *best calculated*" to cure the patient; but, if this is not arrant "quackery," I know not what is. The fact that "regular physicians" so often fail in *removing* "*causes*" of disease, which, when the Thomsonian applies *his* remedies, "*seamper off as fast as they can, like frightened rats from a barn on fire,*" as well as the confession just quoted, proves to *my* satisfaction, at least, that physicians are still very ignorant of either the *causes* of disease, or the *means* and *mode* of *removing* them, or of all together.

tions, and on the cases which "you believe never occurred," the "clue to which," if it can serve any good purpose, shall be given you in the form of certificates, from the patients themselves—more, I will give you an account of *all* the patients I have lost in the last 3 years, the forms of disease of which, and the circumstances *under* which they died; *if you will make the same exhibition of the results of your practice.* You intimate that, if my report of cases were true and the evidence tangible, physicians "would not hesitate, nay, would grasp with avidity, to lay them before the public eye, in order to establish those doctrines." So, reasoning abstractly, *I* would suppose. But I find the *facts* the very reverse; for, when I state *facts* and give my name and character as a voucher, *you* (who preach the doctrine that you *ought* to) will not believe them. I have certificates, numerous enough, of the very kind of cures that you discredit, wrought by the instrumentality of my own hand. If I were to send a copy of each, to each of the "scientific medical journals" in the Union, do you think they would be published, with the recommendation of the editors to all the physicians in their vicinity, to examine and profit by these wonderful exhibitions of medical skill and means? So far from it, sir, it is but a short period since the *miscellaneous* press dared to publish, in relation to these matters, any thing but *scandal* against them, for fear of proscription! while the scientific editors *were* and *still are* advised "not to

---

\* I have just received back again, without note or comment, a review of Dr. Williams's speech in the Maryland Legislature, heretofore alluded to, which I had sent to the editor of the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, though it contained not a few of the facts to which you allude.

sully the pages of their excellent journals," by "noticing professionally," "the steam quackeries of the Thomsons and others."—[Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, volume XI, page 117.—The reason why you "do not see," as well as *hear* of the wonders effected by the Thomsonians, is, you so cordially despise, that you will not suffer yourselves to look at this unceremonious leveling to the dust, by the rude hands of plain men, of all your boasted system of learning and experience! On your nineteenth and twentieth paragraphs, I have already commented. I remark, however, that I cannot myself understand all the principles you have here presented. You have made just about the same havoc of my "theory of disease" and "plan of cure," that [the little dog] "Diamond did of Newton's mathematical calculations," evincing that you understood them very little better; though I doubt not your capacity to comprehend and profit by them, if you would not, as I have said, make such haste to answer and refute them. But I wish not to provoke you.

"*All diseases*" then, proceed from the same cause—"hindrances—obstructions" to the free exercise of the power called life. On the truth of this position, I rest my medical, literary, logical and physiological reputation. When you will give me a correct definition of life, I will tell you *where it is seated*. ["Located, perhaps, in a higher degree, among the digestive organs."—Chapman, *Ther.*, vol. 1, pa.—.] The nature of the obstructions, their mode of opposing the free operations of life, the modes and means by which you are to remove them, and the "fountain" at which life dwells, &c. are the subjects that engage my attention in the daily exercise of my profession as

instructor of medical students, and clinical lecturer, in the "Richmond Infirmary." I did not consider them suitable subjects for a public lecture, even could they have been embraced in it; but your perversions of what I did write, are so numerous and gross, that it is no wonder your "patience is wearied" by looking at "the glaring inconsistencies" *you have introduced*. I entreat both you and the reader to compare, throughout, your "remarks" with the lectures, and I need say no more on this head.

You ask, why we take "the name of Botanical, when we rely as much on steam as any thing else," and when "the American Dispensatory" contains "six or eight hundred or more of botanical remedies, all exercising a specific action, and *among them the famous Lobelia?*"\* I answer, our system is called botanical, because it is *exclusively* such.—Steam indeed, aids our operations very much; but a Thomsonian never steams a person without giving remedies internally. We see not how our taking the name "Botanic," can interfere with you, who draw your resources from all the depots of nature's secrets, and of course cannot limit your grand title to a single kingdom.

You ask, "is the name of *mineral medicines*, so odious to the feelings, and dangerous in their operations on the human system, as to frighten these Thomsonians into convulsions at the very sound

---

\* Ah! "I have it now!" this is the place you must have alluded to, when you said, (paragraph eighth) "Lobelia is *among* the most violent, drastic and deleterious poisons in the *Materia Medica*," &c. You meant, as I before suspected, that it had fallen into the evil company of mercury, antimony, arsenic, opium, savin, colocyath, croton oil, &c. &c. What upon earth do you want of a "deleterious" drug, when you have already so many? and how can it be so praiseworthy in you to use it, and so worthy of the gallows in me? Perhaps your singular logic can explain this.

of their name?" Surely not, the *name* is agreeable enough. When, for example, you speak of mercury for selecting gold from sand, facing looking glasses, filling thermometers and barometers, &c. &c., we are well enough pleased; but, when you speak of calomel, blue pills and precipitates, Fowler's solution, &c., we are insensibly led, by the association of ideas, to think of the salivation, mercurial ulcers, sore gums, loose and rotten teeth and bones, dropsy of the extremities, "stiff incurvated limbs," once suffered by many of us, and even of the 'friendly stroke of death' (which appeared but just before us,) till we imagine that we are almost in reach of his dart—Who would not be "frightened into convulsions" at 'such a train of thought!—We certainly never have argued, from the benevolence of the Creator, nor the names nor appearance of minerals, nor any other data, that "*He could* not provide as good and effectual remedies, for the cure of disease, in the bowels of the earth, as on its surface," &c., nor *do we believe* that he could not. We only state what we know to be true, that *if He has done so, we have not discovered them.*

In paragraph twenty-sixth, you tell us something about what *calomel will do*, but you must not take offence if we prefer the past "experience" of our senses, to your prophetic opinion. You say "*it will purge* our stomach and bowels of all obstructions." We have seen many patients with several large doses in their "stomach" or "bowels," or both, who were nevertheless said, by those scientific gentlemen who gave it, to be "in great danger of dying for the want of something to purge the bowels!" "*It will open* the pores of the *skin* and *remove* fever." Why then do so many per-



sons die of fever with plenty of calomel in them?—"It will give *strength* and tone to the general system." Why then do you use it to reduce the inflammatory action in a general acute fever? "It will control the inordinate action of the liver, and regulate the secretion of the bile." Why then do you suffer people to die of "liver complaints?"—"It will *curb* and *reduce inflammatory action*, [just now you said it would give *strength* and *tone* to the general system,] and it will *stimulate* this *same* system and *add impetus* [no! curb and reduce!] to its circulation." This looks very much like contradiction, but I will not say it is, lest I prove that I understand your assertions no better than you did mine. The principle however, "*seems to me*," to accord with the practice of giving calomel to reduce the patient laboring under inflammatory diathesis, and then giving *more calomel* to strengthen him again! "It will promote digestion, because it has the power of removing the cause of *indigestion*." Why then does Dr. Eoff say that, "for want of some Medicine which would operate in such a manner as to *cleanse the stomach and intestines of all offensive* and irritating matter; physicians [they all have calomel I believe] *have not* been able to perform a cure in ONE case out of TEN, of confirmed dyspepsia or indigestion!" Just hear him out (he is an M. D., and of course tells the truth—no Thomsonian slander here—well, then,) "And therefore, they [physicians] satisfy themselves by producing a temporary relief by emetic and purgative medicines; but so much debility of the stomach is produced by this course, that before it has regained its former tone, the same offensive matter is accumulated, and with it, all the distressing symptoms return, even aggravated." "To re-

lieve this obstinate disease, the whole materia medica has been tried, [no quackery,] from the most powerful articles down to charcoal and wheat bran; but, for the want of such medicine, [as the Thomsonian] nothing but a temporary relief has been procured, and *often the remedy has been worse on the constitution, than the disease!*" Rather a tough yarn from a learned M. D. on the quackish experiments of his brethren on "the whole materia medica, for the cure of dyspepsia!" They must have forgotten to "*try*" "*calomel!*" for you say "it will promote digestion by removing the cause of indigestion." If "it has the power of curing more diseases than *one half of the whole list* of Botanic remedies, *all put together,*" [what proportion is that?]\* why do you abuse us poor Thomsonians, for professing to cure, with (not a single article but,) "one plan of treatment," all the diseases as you call them, which *we can cure at all!*

You speak of your remedies from the mineral and animal kingdoms, and make us Thomsonians say, that all these "blessings of a providential creation, are nothing but so many poisons, and unfit for the uses of man." What a story! We say no such thing. Zinc is very useful for house-tops, copper for money, and various kinds of vessels, bismuth for printing types, arsenic for ornamenting glass, killing rats, &c., iron and steel for almost every purpose but to eat, phosphorus for matches, &c. &c., but does it therefore follow, that steel is to be eaten instead of bread, that ratsbane and corrosive sublimate are to kill vermin, and cure the sick, &c.?

---

\*We are not very learned: but this *proportion* appears to us to be (omitting the algebra of the original note, for want of characters) one half and the whole *all put together*, or the whole and a half of the Botanic materia medica!

A sad "reproach indeed, upon a beneficent Providence," to apply his blessings as he intended we should—metals and minerals in the arts, animals mostly for food and clothing, and vegetables chiefly for food and medicines.

In paragraph twenty-ninth, you "admonish your fellow citizens to beware how they suffer themselves to be *tinkered* upon by these botanic system quacks." 'This is playing the dog in the manger with a vengeance. You are "unable to cure one case in ten of confirmed dyspepsia," and yet you advise the public not to suffer the Thomsonians to do it! Because "dangers, deceptions, delusions, and error await" you at every step of *your* practice, you imagine that ours is equally liable to them. You tell me a pretty tale about making or mending a watch; thereby striving to prove that a man must be intimately acquainted with anatomy, in order to cure disease. A lady lately wrote me all the symptoms she could recollect, and all the *hard names* (not a few) that her physicians had applied to her disease, and then asked me if *I* could do her any good! I replied that they who knew so well the character and seat of her morbid affections, ought surely, as you say they do, to know how to remove them; but as she assured me they had long "*tinkered upon*" *her in vain* with all the articles in the *materia medica*, "that *seemed* to them best calculated" to cure her, I sent a prescription, in obedience to which, she soon recovered her health. Yet, I confess, I could not have "made" a single organ which I taught her how to heal. I rejoice with you, Doctor, that the days of "quackery, will soon follow those of witchcraft and conjuration," and am happy to believe that, ere long, in medicine as in other things, "mystery will be stripped of all

pretence, and practice be confined to common sense."

Finally, in my first Lecture, I showed that, what the world calls reason, is a faculty acquired, improved and perfected, by our observations of, reflections on, and deductions from, matters of fact; and is correct or erroneous, in proportion to the extent and accuracy of our observations and comparisons; that, to acquire, improve and perfect it, in relation to every branch of knowledge attainable by man, is not required to make a man a physician; that its perfection in relation to any one subject, is often attained in a few minutes—"I have it," said Des Cartes, who discovered the reason of Euclid's famous forty-seventh problem, (just as his father entered the garret in which he had shut him up, to see if he would "quit poring over that geometry.") "I have it," and sure enough, he had it, as perfectly as it ever will be "had," "while the sun and the moon endure."—But you labor to prove that I require the gathering up of all the experience of all the world on every subject, in order to convince a man that he has scalded his foot, and that cold water, raw cotton, Irish potatoes or whiskey, will take out the inflammation, and elder salve or almost any other oleaginous substance will heal it.—(Stop, I beg pardon, "every cure must be made by steam and Lobelia! The remedy of remedies!") Perhaps now you will imagine that the excessive heat and the lesion of the circulatory and secretory vessels, that constitute this form of disease, are not "obstructions to the free operation of the powers of life," and therefore do not admit of "the same plan of cure?"

I showed the propriety of judging with caution,

even where we suppose that our observations and comparisons are complete and perfect. But you pronounce me a bad, an "absurd," a "nonsensical" reasoner, when your own careless misconceptions, misquotations and *ignorance*, had been the sole causes of all the absurdity and nonsense which you exhibited to the reader. I showed the folly of condemning any proposition before we have all the knowledge necessary to enable us to do it advisedly and correctly. Hence, rather than give my convictions, as you have done the most of yours, in the form of assertions; I quoted the principal facts on which those convictions were based. You deny these things, without giving proof that they are false, and make bold assertions that you cannot prove, because you cannot obtain the means. I showed that the Botanic System has been condemned without reason; and you turn all this showing (in a manner that would have astonished me, had I seen less of such misrepresentation in controversial writings,) into an attempt to prove that the experience of *all ages on every subject*, is necessary to the perfection of the reason of *one age on any*; and yet, that this perfection has been attained in the life and experience of Samuel Thomson! I gave a history of the origin of the system, and some of the evidences of its correctness. These last, you have completely demolished, rendered *null and void*, by the simple sentence—"which *cases* we *believe*, from good reasons, *never occurred*." I contrasted this system and remedies, with the old, and showed their superiority. This you have set aside, by pronouncing it "nothing of importance!" Quotations from the most learned authors of your own side, showing the fruitlessness of all their experience, the errors

of their theories and the midnight darkness in which their minds are still involved in regard to the healing art, you are pleased to answer, by calling them "hollow vessels" that "sound the loudest." You make no attempt to disprove the charge that the regular system has not in it, truth and consistency enough to entitle it to the name: but is more properly termed, "a source of uncertainty," "the art of conjecture," "the science of guessing," "learned quackery," "striking in the dark," &c. &c. And you are wise to hold your peace, when your answer must be folly. Had you been silent in *many* instances where you have attempted an argument, I for one should have thought more highly of your sagacity as a reasoner, if I had less of your purity of intention. Thus, you perceive, that you have misunderstood, misquoted and misrepresented me; most furiously attacked and condemned what you did not understand, and labored with great zeal and boldness, to make a beautiful science out of what the very heads of the schools that teach it, have very justly styled "the source of uncertainty," "the art of conjecturing," "the science of guessing," "learned quackery," "striking in the dark," "a temple unroofed and cracked at the foundation," &c. &c. I have pointed out some of these errors of yours, and showed that you have not so much as touched the principal 'subject matter of the Lectures;' and now, sir, if you will disprove any one of the prominent points therein touched, you will deserve as much honor and glory, and a present of as much silver plate, as the citizens of Natchez bestowed on Dr. S. A. Cartwright, for curing "*a great many cases of Cholera*," with the "much despised" Thomsonian "remedy," Cayenne Pepper. Yours.

A. CURTIS.

After sundry skirmishes with certain very troublesome "near neighbors," calling themselves "Equity" and "Warden," to the latter of whom he declared that Dr. Curtis and the Steam System were the only objects worthy of his notice, and those against which he planted his staff, (which skirmishes we shall notice more particularly hereafter,) Dr. Delony turned his batteries against us again, as follows :

FOR THE FEDERAL UNION.\*

*Mr. Editor:* I must continue to address you, sir, as I am discussing a *subject* through the medium of your columns, and of course should feel that I was guilty of a want of courtesy and good breeding to *single out* any one individual name to direct my remarks to, especially if I should fall so far short of a *promise* solemnly made, not to "use any epithets or unfair modes of reasoning" as Dr. Curtis has proved himself to have done in his last communication directed to myself. 1.

I must confess Mr. Editor that I was greatly disappointed in the reply which Dr. Curtis thought proper to make to my remarks, instead of *argument* fraught with reason and good sense, and confined to an illustration of the "*manutiae*" and the

---

\* Before the reception of this, we had learned that the compositor had taken the liberty to correct some of the errors of the Doctor's former piece, that were so "glaring that they were absolutely provoking;" but that, as the Doctor considered himself, unaided, an over-match for all the "champions of steam" in the land, in literature as well as in medical science, he determined to print each piece as he found it, and let the public judge. This will account for the difference in the orthography and punctuation especially between the Doctor's "Remarks," and the present article. We print the copy as we find it in the Federal Union.—EDITOR.

defence of the principles of his system, the fallacy of which was so successfully exposed in my review of his two lectures, he has blundered over all the important points which were introduced into that review, and *hitched* upon *incidental expressions* the least connected with the subject matter under consideration, against these, he has affected to direct his whole *batteries* of frauthy abuse and *grammatical spattering* with the restlessness of a mad Buffalo, wraped up in his own vain and presumptive egotism, he rattles along like a *shuck* in a *whirlwind* creating a great noise in the bushes without any father effect. 2.

The Doctor seems to take great *umbrage* because I complimented him with the title of "learned Lecturer," in doing this, I did not know that I was casting any "reproach" on the gentleman, I thought *he so considered himself* or he would not have attempted to *deliver lectures* or "teach" a congregation of "enlightened gentlemen," but if the Doctor *does not* consider himself *learned* in his art, we must conclude that he treated his audience with as much *impoliteness* at least in attempting to "lecture" them on a subject in which he was *not learned* as he seems to think that we have treated him with, in calling him, what he actually acknowledges he was not, very likely however the doctor concluded that he was lecturing an audience not very learned itself, and that he would just *dash* along in all the *splendour* of his eloquence, say any thing on "general heads," the "manutiae," of his system was not worth "teaching," the "*bigger the fool the better the luck*" and this was all the Doctor cared to rest his system upon. The Doctor charges us also with calling him the "champion of steam" we presume nothing but his great



desire to be *thought* the "champion of steam" could have so blinded him to the correct allusion of our remark we will not say that his misconception in this particular, proceeded from a deficiency of his knowledge of English Grammar, for we presume, from his frequent reference to its *rules* in reply to our remarks, that he understands all about it. We will here give the sentence which we penned and see if any other person who was not expecting or anxious for some such compliment, will say that, that "epithet" was applied to Dr. Curtis, here it is "as we proceed onward with the lectures, we get deeper and deeper into the *nonsensical jargon* of the champion of steam, the Lecturer says "Dr. Thomson tells physicians that *under their very feet* grow sure and *safe remedies* for *all diseases*" &c. &c. Now who will say that we here alluded to Dr. Curtis as the champion of steam? we intended no such *high compliment* to the Doctor, we made a quotation of the *nonsensical jargon* which we alluded to, and this was Dr. Thomsons and not Dr. Curtis', for says Doctor Curtis, "Doctor Thomson tells physicians" &c. But were we to continue the correction of all his misstatements, such as the above and the *delusive cast* which he attempts to give to the *true sense* and *meaning* of our remarks, we should find neither time or room for any thing else, but a continued correction of his *wilful misrepresentations*, he operates on the "DECEPTIVE SYSTEM" and studies harder to *delude* than to *convince* his readers. 3.

The Doctor says "he calls physicians by no *reproachful terms* nor does he *approve* of such conduct in Dr. Thomson or any one else," indeed, then the Doctor does not advocate the system of Thom-

son, for three-fourths of his system is made up of *abusive terms* and *coarse vulgar language* towards the medical profession; It is not a little surprising that the Doctor should condemn any part of Thomson's system and hold the balance to be *all perfection*, for we presume the same "*reason*" and "*experience*" and the same *spirit* and *genius* pervaded and dictated the whole. Thus sir you are *dropping off* from the "champion" Thomson, will not claim his *reason* and *experience* and his *immortal genius* as your *light* and *guide*, and is vain enough to substitute your own "*reason* and *experience*" in the place of his, although you once asserted that his was perfect, dont cringe Doctor, if the lash is too keen for you, stand up to it like a hero, although it may be as hot as steam itself. 4.

The Doctor seems to think we write as though we considered him our enemy, indeed we should consider him but a feeble enemy at best, men frequently judge others by their own feelings, and Dr. Curtis feeling himself to be our enemy, it was nothing but poor human nature in him to conclude that we were his enemy— 5.

The Doctor says "the answer to your first paragraph I may safely leave in the hands of Equity," and yet he has thought proper to go on in a lengthy misrepresentation of that paragraph, We alluded, as plainly as the english language could allow us, [why didn't you try Latin or Greek, Doctor, seeing the *english* failed you.—ED.] to the *system of practice* and not its *unfortunate effects* among the human family, hence our assertion that "silence would be the better policy and the best *argument* against a *system* which has no *foundation* in *truth* or *common sense* and contrary to all *enlightened reason*," the shocking effects of his sys-

tem, which the Doctor have pourtrayed in their *true colors*, while commenting on this paragraph will we dare say "arrest and suppress its deplorable ravages" much sooner than any paragraph which we might "stop to pen" against it, so much for the Doctors comments on this part of our remarks, but such is his "unfair mode" of reasoning throughout, and it becomes our disagreeable and disgusting task to correct this unfair reasoning (if reasoning it can be called) and the many misrepresentations which he has resorted to, mainly the *sum* and *substance* of his lengthy tirade of *nonsense*. 6.

He labors hard to prove that a Physician at the *bed side* of his patient, knows no more of what he is going to do, than a *blind man striking at random* with a club, We presume he knows as much at least as a steam doctor does, when he is standing by a Kettle of boiling water with his patient fainting over it, gasping for breath. 7.

I am really fearful that the name of Dr. Waterhouse will superceed that of the renowned Thomson, I am somewhat astonished that Dr. Curtis should pin his faith so strongly to the skirts of Dr. Waterhouse as to leave the great Thomson in the *shade*, the father and discoverer or inventer of a system so *wonderfully perfect*, surely ought to be best light and authority on that system, 8.

The assertion by Dr. Waterhouse that Quackery has done more for the medical art than all the Universities since the time of Charlemagne, will be believed only by those whose *interest* it is to entertain such belief, but how, pray, has it done more for the medical art? did he tell us? has he proved this fact? he has not, whose evidence then is mostly to be relied upon, the *bare asser-*

tion of Dr. Waterhouse or the whole medical faculty to the contrary. [Where is *your* proof that "the whole medical faculty" have asserted the "contrary?"—ED.] The boldness of the Quack, his utter carelessness of consequences, leads him to the administration of medicines and the application of means whose qualities and effects are unknown to him, in such inexperienced hands, ignorant as he is of the parts, principles and peculiarities of the human system, these medicines and means have too often proved fatal to human life, The medical profession, aware of their own responsibility to their fellow being, and setting a *higher value* on human life, they avoid giving medicines whose qualities they know not of, or knowing they are prepared to give them in such portions, the constitution, habit &c of the patient considered, and at such times as are most favorable to a safe and effectual operation, not indiscriminately and at all times as the steam and Lobelia are applied and administered, without the least attention to the nature seat or stage of the disease. 9.

The Doctor grants what I said "that reason is an improvable faculty" but asks at the same time "may we not reason and investigate from wrong premises" did I not state that fact? when I said "men frequently reason wrongfully from wrong impressions" Why does the Doctor seek to assume my own ground and attempt to place me in the same situation into which he has unfortunately *reasoned* himself, this however is one of his *deceptive modes* of argument. 10.

The Doctor charges me with misquoting him in the paragraph in which he couches his theory of diseased action, that I said "these *obstructions* caused a greater quantity of *blood* and *heat* than

usual around the heart which *blood* (the doctor said "*which heat*") finds its way to the contracted skin, where it *accumulates*, *looks angry* and produces the peculiar effect denominated fever" It makes not the slightest difference Doctor—whether you said *blood* or *heat*, they are both coequal and coextensive, and we will condemn you either way, Which sir do you suppose causes the "*angry*" or red appearance of an inflamed surface, or the ruddy glow of the cheek? the heat or blood of the system, of course the *blood*, where it "*accumulates*" and *causes* heat, so it appears that the blood must *first* find its way to the surface in "*greater quantities*" before the "*angry appearance*" of which you speak or the "*peculiar effect*" (Heat) denominated "*fever*" can take place. 11.

If the Doctor believes that *heat* could be restored or made to "*find its way*" to the cold and clammy extremities of a patient who is prostrate, without a *reaction* is produced in the circulating system by which a "*greater quantity of blood*" is sent to the extreme vessels of the surface where it produces warmth—*heat*, he greatly deceives himself—then of course his *theory* is founded on "*wrong premises*"—This *bare allusion* to his *theory of diseased action* is all the notice which the Doctor seems desirous to pay to our successful refutation of the principles of his *unfounded* system and common sense will teach my readers whether or not he has gained any thing by this feeble attempt to disprove my position and strengthen his—Thus has he abandoned the *main ground* of his system, *the theory of diseases*, consequently the *plan of cure* must be equally absurd and untenable, Then the whole mass must fall to the ground and nothing but an obstinacy

equal to his ignorance could induce any individual to cling to a superstructure destitute of order or architecture and already tumbling to the dust for the want of a solid foundation. 12.

We might here stop with the full confidence that every sensible man has already passed his condemnatory sentence on the absurd reasonings and the *skipping-and-jumping* arguments, which the Doctor has thought proper to introduce, evading altogether the main points of discussion, but as his strange ideas afford more matter of curiosity and amusement, than reflection, we will proceed to notice a few of them. 13.

The Doctor says "that a moments reflection might have convinced us, that it would have been *improper* in him to *teach* all the *manutiae* of the science in a single Lecture before a *mixed audience* when he had been invited only to present a *general view* of the subject." Indeed Doctor, and do you not think that you had time and room enough in the long article which you had the politeness to direct to us, to "teach" us something of the "manutiae" of your science, we do not believe that you were "invited" to give us, in that article, "a general view of the subject" nor were you addressing a "*mixed audience*," surely then you might have condescended to "teach" us something of the "manutiae" of your valuable system, That is what we ask for sir—and, it appears to us, is what a "mixed audience" would have mostly desired, in order to understand your system, you say that the principles of your system can be understood by men of the most ordinary capacities, if so, we think it would have been no very great task for you, to "teach" us its "manutiae" and then sir we should not "have the mortification of

still finding ourselves ignorant" of the principles of your *plain system*, but say you, "If however you insist on being thus minutely informed, come to the Richmond Infirmary, and you shall be taught both the Theory and Practice" a shrewd plan indeed to *slip out* of a matter you cannot explain or "teach," If I will "come" to the Richmond Infirmary you will "teach" me, a flat acknowledgement that you have nothing to "teach,"—again you say "it is *improper* to teach the *manutiae* of your science to a 'mixed' congregation," Improper is it sir? for our part, Doctor we think it *very proper* that the "*manutiae*" of the medical science should be taught, we can have but little confidence in a system whose *manute principles* are so improper or unnecessary to be taught or understood, What strange ideas for a man to advance who *sets* himself up as an *instructor* in a science in which human life is involved, We can draw no other conclusion from your assertions Doctor, than this that your system, either has *no principles* at all, or if it has any, that you are incapable of "teaching" them, do you not conclude with us, "acknowledge the truth and shame the devil." 14.

To our inquiry, "what physicians done for sure and safe remedies before Dr. Thomson was born?" he answers, "they did without them," here he denies that lobelia is a safe and sure remedy for it is well known that this article of medicine, was known to the profession long before Thomson knew any thing about it, and so was cayenne and myrrh also, [Who knows it? Not Dr. Deloney.—Ed.] Take care Doctor or you will not do your famous system much credit if you continue to make many such blunders. 15.

Again the doctor resorts to a discription of

the great and numerous cures that have been effected by his system of practice, and in this *puffing* and *boasting* argument he relates *fifteen cases* of measles in one family which were cured without losing one single one, Wonderful indeed! What will the Doctor think when we tell him that we have seen *twice fifteen cases* of the same disease, all in one family, get well without, the administration of *any medicine* at all, will he believe us? But to be candid we confess that we have heard of the good effects of the steam and Lobelia in two instances in which they acted like a *charm*, and are worthy to be related here in addition to those which the Doctor has already described, the first was a case in one of the western states in which the virtues of the Lobelia were manifested in a most astonishing, and no less gratifying, manner—a gentleman who was out on a hunting excursion on one of those noble rivers of the west where game is abundant, happened unfortunately to be bitten by a Rattle Snake, as soon as the accident occurred he turned for home, but did not get far before he fell to the ground, here in an agony of pain and distress indisscribable and with no helping hand near him, he rolled about on the earth in all the horrid and excruciating torment which his situation was calculated to inspire—All at once he felt ease from his pain and sickness, calmness and composure took the place of restlessness, anxiety and despair, reflecting on his situation but a moment ago, he could but wonder what divine and providential aid had ministered to his relief, so effectually and suddenly, when accidentally he cast his eyes on a bunch of lobelia, over which he had fortunately rolled, straightway he was healed, rose on his feet rejoicing and continued on his hunting



excursion as though nothing had happened and was ever after this a healthier heartier man than he ever was before in his life before!!! 16.

The second is a case in which the virtues of the Steam ware no less remarkable and occurred in one of the northern states—An emigrant Frenchman who was engaged at his work in a powder magazine was most shockingly mangled by the explosion of the whole building from some accidental cause, one of his legs and an arm were torn from his body, the bleeding and dying man was found among the fragments, writhing in great agony and crying out for help, about this time a steam Doctor (no doubt a special messenger) happened to come to the spot he examined the man and declared that he could relieve him and restore his limbs if they could be found, they ware immediately hunted up, the steam was raised apace and the Frenchman hoisted over it, as soon as he was raised to a good welding heat the limbs ware placed in their former position and soon became firmly united, he was then taken off and tempered down, and every one present avered after the most minute examination that they could not discover even whare they ware joined together, so completely was the reunion of the parts effected, and the Frenchman declared that he had more strength in these two limbs than he ever had before, a sad misfortune however occurred in this case,—but not to be attributed to the steam, in the hurry and bustle of the moment when the limbs ware about to be welded, the leg was placed on hind part before and was not discovered untill too late in consequence of which the Frenchman is at times most prodigiously harrassed and vexed in consequence of one leg's wanting to go the oposit course of the other. 17.

But we think we can make a fair set off to all the great and wonderful cures the Doctor has effected, and the two above into the bargain, if not greatly overbalance them, with the horrid and shocking consequences of these two agents (steam and lobelia) of human destruction. If after reading the cases which shall follow and which rest on authority of indisputable veracity, the community shall persist in giving countenance to a species of destruction of human life calculated to shock the stoutest nerves, then they will not be convinced though death may stare them full in the face. 18.

A young medical friend of fine talents, and who bids fair to occupy no ordinary stand in his profession, sends us the two following cases— 19.

“A negro man belonging to Mr. S.—was attacked last winter with Dropsy of the Thorax and abdomen. the phenomena of which differed in no respect with the routine of cases of the like kind, the boy was sent to our shop for examination with a request that we should give him such remedies as his case might seem to demand, we gave him pills composed of calomel, squills and dijetalis as a deobstruent and diurectic—the usual dydragogues and directed extensive counter irritation to the thorax and abdomen, The good effects of this course was soon manifest, the gums became a little sore and every vestage of the disease disappeared. To prevent a reaccumulation of water however we directed a free use of Bals. Copaiva which I will here take the liberty to observe is a most superior remedy. The pills were discontinued and every thing appeared to be doing well, as soon however as his mouth got well, the disease reappeared, he was subjected again to the same treatment with the same good effects, he

continued to mend slowly but surely—The oppression about the Precordia and dyspnea had pretty much subsided, and the paucity of Urine and thirst had entirely disappeared, his master about this time *set him to work in the new ground* where it was his ill fortune to encounter, a few days subsequently, the man who was to send him to a premature grave, a Thomsonian passed by the new ground and happening to find the master there, persuaded him to have his boy subjected to the operation of steaming, it was applied accordingly and the Doctor after promising to return in a few days to repeat the process, took his leave, This promise however he never fulfilled for the boy died some few hours after the Doctor left!! Such sir was the ultimatum of this case, that the boy died of a species of murder the most scrupulous will not pretend to deny.” 20.

2d “Mrs. M, the wife of a steam Doctor was attacked in April last with Peripneumonia, for the relief of which her kind and affectionate consort applied the steam and nos 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. for aught I know to the contrary, most liberally, but to his discomfiture—his wife did not get any relief from his remedies, and having ascended to the top round of the ladder of his learning, he was easily persuaded by the friends of the patient to call in a physician, Dr. J. was sent for, who found his wife very sick, she was bled copiously and placed under the effects of the antimonial solution, she got better immediately and mended apace until entirely well. 21.

A case given by the lady herself, last spring “she was unwell but was going about, having seen a relation who persuaded her she could be cured by the steam and lobelia, Mrs D. prevail-

ed on her husband to let her try it, with reluctance he consented, the Lobelia was given and she was placed over the steam, she soon *fainted* however, and her husband caught her before she fell, one of her feet slipped into the boiling water and was considerably *scalded*, she was lifted to her bed and after a while revived, the steam Doctor still insisted to have her steamed in the bed, but she told him she believed she was fully satisfied,"—22.

"Mrs C. of M. County was taken sick this summer, her husband sent for a steam Doctor, he came, gave the lobelia, left more to be given if it did not operate, with directions if the whole did not operate to give warm *salt and water* and if that did not cause the medicine to operate to give the woman a portion of *ambear!!* The lobelia did not operate, the salt and water was given yet no operation and the woman was very sick, the ambear next was given and the poor woman soon sunk into death!!! 23.

Case given by my friend Dr. H. W. D. of F. county laboring under dropsy of the chest, had been somewhat unwell, he was prevailed upon to call in a steam Doctor, accordingly sent, the Doctor arrived and commenced with the *lobelia* which operated very powerfully—the steam was then applied which weakened Mr. D. considerably and he was lifted to his bed in a very exhausted condition, when the administration of no. 6. was commenced under this treatment he grew worse very fast and finding his situation a very critical one he immediately sent for a physician, after sometime with strict attention and good nursing Mr. D. found himself on the mend and at length recovered;" What would another day, with the steam, Lobelia and Cayenne, have produced in this case? 24.

Case given by the attending physician.

Mr. S. of T. County, was attacked last summer with ague and fever had been sick four or five days, the fourth or fifth day sent for Dr. ——— in great haste, he arrived about the middle of the evening found the patient *prostrated*, countenance livid and sunken, extremities cold, profuse clammy sweat over the whole surface, great internal heat and excessive thirst, pulse quick and small, great restlessness and hurried respiration, died in three or four hours—The lobelia and cayenne combined had been given to this man today, and he was steamed, the medicine operated but partially and while over the steam he requested to be taken off, stating that he was getting very weak,” 25.

The following case was given by a brother and sister of the lady who were present during the whole time—and protested against such treatment “Mrs. L. of M. County was attacked last fall with a mild bilious fever and walked home one and a half miles after the attack with but little inconvenience, that evening red pepper was rubbed all over her body. which produced considerable irritation and she complained heavily of the severity of the application, second day, commenced with what they called diaphoretic powders, strong with cayenne, the fever increased, the heat and thirst became very great, continued this practice with steaming four or five days, no operation from the bowels,—fifth day, another steam doctor was called in, commenced the administration of Lobelia and cayenne, puked small portions of phlegm, complained of continued and excessive heat in the stomach and bowels, yet the cayenne and lobelia continued nearly every hour during the day and night for 4 or 5 days longer, still continued to get

worse, and grow weaker during this time, fever increased, bottles of hot water and hot rocks were kept around the patient under a thick covering, curtains drawn closely around and the bed placed near a hot fire, the complaints of the poor woman now became more heavy and distressing, but to no purpose, although she repeatedly exclaimed that she must die soon without better treatment, partial spasms now came on, and when attacked with one of these, the remedy was a jerking or tossing of the bed to keep the patient in commotion and she was directed to keep her eyes moving or turning about for the purpose, they said, of preventing them from becoming *fixed* or *set*, she became more exceedingly exhausted and was evidently sinking, at her urgent request and the solicitations of her friends a physician was now, the 10 or 12 day, called in, when he arrived there was every appearance of approaching dissolution and he pronounced her case a hopeless one, she lingered but a short time longer and died a victim to this unmerciful butchery, the quantity of medicine taken during the day and night, was about three quarts of a fluid mixture made strong with red pepper or cayenne, and during the treatment of the case a portion of this same mixture, by order of the steam Doctor *was frequently injected into the vagina*, what this most cruel part of all her treatment, was designed for, no one can possibly imagine—, It was also observed by some one present that she ought to be bled, the Doctor observed that “no person had any more blood than they should have,” so the doctor persisted in his course untill he had exhausted all his skill, and observed to his patient “I have done every thing that can be done for you and you are obliged to die, all skill has failed and you

must submit yourself to death, this observation raised the poor woman nearly on her feet in bed and convulsions were the consequence. 26.

Statement given to me, by the physician called in,

“ I received a message between midnight and day, arriving at the house where the poor woman was I found her quite delirious, tongue much inflamed and almost swollen out of her mouth, difficulty of breathing, excruciating pain in the bronchiae, pulse one hundred and thirty in a minute, language cannot express the feeling I had at this time, for this unfortunate individual, after inquiring into her disease and the treatment she had received from the steam Doctors—” 27.

The following letter was received by us a few days ago,

*N—— August 27, 1835.*

DEAR SIR—Yours of the 11th came to hand by due course of mail requesting a statement of the case of Mrs. P. my daughter It was a subject of so much delicacy that I have delayed giving you an answer untill I could see Mr. P. and learn the particulars from him— 28.

Mrs. P. was not in good health for some time previous to her death laboring under a disposition to dropsy, but had been partially relieved by the usual remedies several times but had concluded she would not enjoy good health, and having been steamed by C. H. S. for rheumatism, and thinking she received some benefit from the operation, she was induced to try the Thomsonian plan of treatment in her then existing case, S. having per-

suaded her that he could relieve her entirely! 29.

He visited her on monday or tuesday and administered some lobelia, he then went off and staid untill friday night at which time he came to my house and on the next morning went to see her but returned in a short time. I asked him if he had given any medicine he stated he had not but should as soon as he returned, which was in a few minutes, when about to begin the operation Mr. P. stated to him that he did not think his wife able to undergo the operation and was afraid for her to undertake it, but he persisted in his assertions that he could cure her, but would not begin until Mr. P. would pay him twenty dollars for the right to use the remedy! he then gave her the *lobelia*—which seemed to operate very violently, so much so, that the friends of Mrs. P. expressed their fears of her death, but he stated that the medicine was operating just as he wished and would produce the desired effect— 30.

The family becoming still more alarmed some other observation was made relative to her death, when he stated that if Mrs. P. died that day he would agrée to be hung the next day and that there was no danger and still persisted in like assertions untill death relieved her from the operations of lobelia and the hands of E. H. S.

As soon as the breath had left the body he ran to the horse lot, caught his own horse and started it is said in a gallop through the woods leaving his saddle bags and martingales hanging on the fence, and the next account we had of him he was in Greenville district S. C. he wrote several letters back one to myself and some to others, from which I inferred he never intended visiting Georgia again. The matter passed off however and after



a lapse of time he returned and was considered by the mass of community as the destroyer of my daughter,—

R.——” 31.

The above cases requires no comment they speak for themselves in a most warning voice, we have others on hand, but surely the community will be convinced from what we have already given, If any person doubts them, let him call on us and we will satisfy him, of their whole truth, for humanity's sake we could wish that they ware not correct, but let us proceed with the Doctors article, He seemes to be surprised that calomel should have so many different effects on the human system, he is not aware I presume that Tartar Emetic will also puke, purge, and sweat and that lobelia will puke or kill, or kill even if it pukes. 32.

The Doctor endeavors to disprove my argument in favor of the *progress and improvement* of reason, and *substitutes* the word “*experience*” altogether in order to carry out successfully his *deceptive system*, thus he says “the *momentary experience* of the Virginia servant who found a wedge of gold on his master's plantation, not even “by the guide of” geologic “principles,” but when in pursuit of the cows, was worth more than the “ages of experience of all the alchymists that ever lived.” indeed Doctor, suppose it had been a wooden wedge could it have been worth the same, then of course it must have been an *accident* and only happened to be a gold instead of a wooden wedge, but did the “momentary experience” exist before he found the wedge of gold or after? after of course, then the discovery of the wedge was *chance work* altogether and not the result of “*ex-*

perience," but we will carry this idea a little further Doctor how did the servant know the wedge to be a *gold one*? and how did he know any thing of the *value* of this precious metal? probably his master told him, well, how did his master know it? why Doctor I recon "the ages of experience of all the alchymists" must have taught him this useful information, so sir we are still willing to rest the science of medicine on the immutable basis of *truth*, as resulting from the investigation, experience and improvement of ages, such experience sir as taught the master of this servant to know that the "wedge" which he accidentally discovered, was gold and of great value, had he not known this fact, the wedge would have been of no more value to him than a stone, Thus it is Doctor that you boldly set up the "momentary experience" of an *accidental* discovery of a prize, *against* the *truth* of that *experience* which taught you the *value* of such a prize, and thus it is also, that you set up the "momentary" haphazard "experience" of Samuel Thomson against the valuable *truths* and *matters of fact* which result from the progress and improvement of reason and the experience of ages, The Doctor says that I undertake to prove that "providential observation" or chance is not the part of a mans experience, not so Doctor, we contend that accidental discoveries are not the results of experience or the improvement of reason, but when a accidental circumstance does take place, its effects then becomes a matter of experience— 33.

At last we have come to something of a theory again, the Doctor says "all diseases then proceed from the same cause *hinderances obstructions*, to the free exercise of the power called life" at the

“fountain” we presume, then says “when” I “will give him a definition of life he will tell me whare it is seated” I thought the Doctor would invent some slipry plan in order to endeavor to creep out of the difficulties into which he has unexpectedly fallen, he tells us in his theory that “when obstructions clog the operations of life at the fountain, in order to remove these obstructions, he *adds additional heat to the fountain*,” now we thought the Doctor understood whare this “fountain” was seated, and we only asked him to inform *us* whare it was seated in order that we might know how to cure diseases also, by *supplying* this “fountain” as the Doctor docs, with “additional heat” The Doctor surely ought to know whare *life* was seated, from the case, with which he speaks, of *supplying* its “fountain” with “additional heat.” 34.

If *all diseases* then procced from the *same cause*, why are not all diseases alike? the same causes always produce the same effects, and the same remedy, if all diseases proceeded from the same cause, would cure all diseases, tharefore Thomson nor the Doctor have as yet discovered this great and sovereign *remedy for all diseases*, for says the Doctor, “I had told you that Dr Thomson described more than *seventy different remedies* and given us *rules* for the *discovery* of as *many more as we please*” what a convenient system of practice and easy science this must be, Dr Thomson has just made it a matter of *pleasure* with his deluded disciples to *discover* a good *remedy* when they *pleased* to do so, that is, if they find one wont do, try another, if that wont do, keep trying untill you hit upon the right one, and then you may cure your patient if he is not too nigh dead from trying, this

is the only way left to us to conjecture, by which, they *discover* their remedies, for if they have any other *rules* by which they may *discover* as “*many more*” *remedies* as they *please*, they have failed to give them to us, probably these *rules* belong to the “*manutiae*” of their science,—But “the nature of these obstructions” says the Doctor “their *mode* of *opposing* the free operations of life, the *modes* and *means* by which you are to *remove* them, and the *fountain* at which *life dwells* &c, are *subjects* which engage my attention in the daily exercise of my profession” and yet he did not consider them *suitable subjects* for a public lecture, nor has he ever attempted to explain or discuss them in his long address directed to me, from which the above quotation is made, “the fountain at which life dwells” is a subject which has engaged his daily attention, and yet he cannot tell us where it is ‘seated,’ so the very life blood principles of his system he does not consider suitable subjects for discussion, the nature of these ‘obstructions’ which cause all diseases, is not worth explaining in a public lecture, Nor does the ‘modes and means’ by which we are to remove those ‘obstructions’ seem to be at all essential for us to know, nor the seat of the ‘fountain’ ‘at which life dwells’ and to which all these ‘modes and means’ are to be directed, worthy of explanation, either in ‘a public Lecture’ or a paper discussion, although his system is boldly charged as unfounded and without principle, yet he cannot prove such charges erroneous, defend his system against them, nor establish it on even reasonable grounds— 35.

The Doctor requests us to give him ‘a correct definition of life’ and he will then tell us ‘where it is seated’ a question which we never asked him,

but for his gratification we will say to him, that we believe life to be, the *divine spirit* of our creator, man was made perfect in all his *parts*—yet was he like a stock or stone, he moved not, but God *breathed* into his *nostrils* the *breath of life*, and he became a *living soul*, this living animating *spirit* pervades universal nature, the spangled heavens, the verdant fields, the mountains and the sea, the lightnings flash and the thunders awful roar, with peal on peal reverberating through this vast universe, the wind that gently wafts the laden ship to her destined port, the busy bustling hum of man, the labouring ant, all proclaim this divinely animating principle, and this is life its ‘fountain’ is God. 36.

Says the immortal Watts, alluding to the system of man,

“ Strange that a harp of a thousand strings  
Should keep so long in tune.”

The ‘operations of life’ then cannot be ‘obstructed’ especially at its ‘fountain’ some of the ‘*strings*’ may become untuned and for this reason we humbly approach this delicate and complicated machinery of man and *endeavour* to retune those tender discordant strings or refit the *deranged wheel* which seems to interrupt the smoothe and regular action of the whole machinery, and how shall we do this unless we know what chord is untuned or wheel deranged, wheather it be the brain, lungs, stomach or intestines, liver, spleen, Kidnies, Uterus &c &c. and how shall we know which of these important parts is deranged, structural or functional, unless we *mark* the *symptoms* which attend the derangement of each and every one of them,—

would a watchmaker, if his machinery is dull in its action from the collection of dust or dirt, make his main spring stronger in order to propell his machinery and clear out these 'obstructions,' by increased action? No. he would clear away the dust and add oil to the wheels, Would a miller, because the cogs of his wheels ware deranged, 'add an additional' quantity of water, in order to force his machinery to run more smothe? No. for he never would by this means effect his desired object, he would ruin his machinery, but if he was wise he would refit his cogs and the machinery would again run as smoothly as ever,—so it is *not* the 'obstructions which clog the operations of life at the fountain' that causes disease, the 'operations of life at the fountain' cannot be 'clogged,' but it is a derangement of some of the *parts* of the machinery itself which constitutes disease, and not the 'fountain' which moves it, and the Doctor might continue to 'add all the additional heat' he could possibly raise by steam, cayenne or lobelia to the fountain of which he speaks and he never will remove his 'obstructions,' but if he will apply the *proper remedies* to the wheel itself which may be deranged and which causes irregularity in the balance of the machinery, he will have no need of 'additional' *power* or *force* at the 'fountain' and this is what the physician would *endeavour* to do. conscious, as he is of his frail and feeble ability and means when compared with the power of his maker, he would humbly approach the bed side of his suffering fellow man and through the favor of Providence, *endeavour* to give him relief from his pain, *endeavour* to restore the deranged part of this delicate machinery to its accustomed healthy action, for seemingly the most simple of these

wheels may be deranged and death will ensue from its consequences, the most extreme branches instead of the 'fountain' may be injured and cause death, the smallest link in the chain of this delicate structure may be broken and the loss of life will ensue in the whole, how necessary then to direct our attention to the *injured part* and not to the fountain where all is perfect,—But Dr. Curtis *endeavours* to do nothing about the matter. he cures his patients right off at hand, and nothing but old age shall waste away and destroy them, hear what he says 'what the medical profession *endeavours* to do, the Thomsonians *actually accomplish*,' how vain and presumptive, this bold assertion. what a defiance of the will and power of his maker, is here inadvertently expressed by this conceited *puff*, we say inadvertently, for we cannot believe that any man in his common senses would use such *loose expressions* in connection with so serious a matter. 38.

We have gone through the Doctors article, and have made corrections of the most important misstatements and misrepresentations which he has made of our remarks, our arguments in those remarks stand as they ware, he has not refuted one single one and he will have to try it again. Of his Theory and plan of cure, which we upset entirely, he has not 'stoped to pen' a single remark, but gets out of the scrape by telling me, if I will ride seven hundred miles to the Richmond Infirmary he will then teach me his Theory and practice too, has the Doctor not the conscience to save me from this long ride, Nor has he although his article was exceedingly lengthy, given us the least information of the 'manutiae' of his science, but he has kept entirely aloof from the subject of discus-

sion, there can be no better evidence of the untenable nature of the grounds, on which he presumes to rest his system, hence his disposition to keep off from the main question and his fondness for railing about 'epithets' and 'terms'— 39.

We ask for light Doctor, we ask for the '*manutiae*' of your science, the 'nature of those obstructions,' 'their *mode* of opposing the free *operations*, of life' 'the *mode* and *means* by which we are to remove them and the *fountain* at which life *dwells*,' all these 'important subjects' which 'engage your attention, in the daily exercise of your profession' we ask information upon, give us light, give us a system of principle established on truth, and not one of falsehood and speculation,— 40.

EDWARD DELONY.

Talbotton, Sept. 15, 1835.

---

Totally disgusted with his want of talent and learning, as well as with the reckless impudence of his bold assertions, we should have left Dr. Deloney to 'flounder' on, 'like a shuck in a whirlwind'—excellent, [scarcely derived from Hebrew, Greek or Latin, however; the Indians or negroes must have taught the Doctor this classic figure,] but for the intimation, from some of his intelligent readers, that we might prevent him from deluding many that were *not* quite so intelligent, by showing up still farther his folly and recklessness. Let it be remembered, however, that the review of Dr. Deloney derived consequence from the assertion of the editor of the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal (see our preface,) that he "perfectly agreed with the talented author of the review."



We therefore sent to the Editor of the Federal Union the following

## REPLY.

FOR THE FEDERAL UNION.

MR. EDITOR: If you agree in opinion with Dr. Deloney, that my address to him, very politely admitted into your columns, exhibited a want of courtesy to yourself; I trust you will pardon that offence, when I assure you that no disrespect was intended. Whether the Doctor or myself has used the most "epithets or unfair modes of reasoning," I am perfectly willing to leave to the decision of yourself and your numerous and intelligent readers.

The Doctor promised "WARDEN" that he would not be drawn from the main subject, "the theory of the steam system, and the practice founded on that theory." But, I am sorry to find so little in his answer to me, that appears to bear very heavily upon either. He complains that I have "blundered over all the important points introduced into his review," in which he had "successfully exposed the fallacy" of the Thomsonian principles, or my defence of those principles. I dare not venture to say which he means, since my sad misapprehension of the meaning of the words, 'champion of steam!' 'As we proceed with the *lectures*, says he, we get still deeper and deeper into the nonsensical jargon of the champion of steam.' Who, reader, would you suppose is here meant by the champion of steam? Dr. Deloney says it is Dr. Thomson, not the lecturer! I suppose, therefore, that I must believe Dr. Thomson, not myself, the

author of the lectures I delivered in Baltimore.— This, however, is not more difficult for me, than to believe that poison is good to cure disease, that taking half the blood will either purify the remainder or promote the health, or that the fever which God ordained to life, should make itself an instrument of death. The Doctor says, that I sent him little else than ‘frauthy abuse and grammatical spattering.’ It is evident that these sent to Dr. Deloney, were as ill applied as ‘coals sent to New Castle.’ For my own part, I should be perfectly willing to leave the controversy as it is, with the ‘intelligent people,’ Dr. Ds. jury; but, in obedience to the request of several of them, for the benefit of those that are not so intelligent, I speak once more.— Though I do not think myself an article of so much importance to the good people of Georgia, that they would be either profited or amused by an exposure of my personal consequence, or my ambitious designs in the delivery of a lecture to a Baltimore audience; I beg leave to protest that I have never authorized Dr. Deloney to explain my *motives* for action or argument. He will give no credit to the favorable testimonies respecting lobelia, of Drs. Waterhouse, Hersey, Montgomery, and others who have taken the article themselves, and witnessed its effects perhaps a thousand times on others; but, he says, ‘no one will question the authority of Dr. Coxe,’ who says from mere hearsay, he does not say that he ever witnessed such a result, that, ‘if it does not puke or evacuate powerfully, it frequently destroys the patient.’ I can believe the former testimony, because it accords with my own experience; but I cannot the latter, because, in three years constant use of the article, in doses varying from five grains to half an ounce and

more, I have never seen any such effect as Dr. Coxe describes. Dr. Deloney says, the quack administers medicines of whose properties and effects he is ignorant, without knowledge of the character, location or stage of the disease, thus producing great mischief; but, that the medical profession, knowing all these things, 'are prepared to give them in such portions, the constitution and habit of the patient considered, and at such times as are most favorable to a safe and effectual operation.' I had proved from the history of medicine and the testimony of the heads of its principal schools, and of other gentlemen eminent in the profession, that the above description of a quack well fitted the man who slavishly followed the authorities of standard authors, and I now add that the sequent character of the physician is better illustrated in the botanic practitioner, than in any other class of the medical profession.

The Doctor says that I assume his ground when I admit that reason is an improvable faculty. I certainly did not know, when, in the Baltimore Lyceum, I maintained the doctrines of the improvement and perfection of reason, I was trespassing on the rights of Dr. Deloney. He admits that he misquoted me; but says 'it makes not the slightest difference!' He seems determined to condemn me at all hazards. He says he successfully refuted my 'theory of diseased action,' in his review. I beg his pardon, but I understood him to say that he did not comprehend it, and merely to ask a few questions relative to the meaning, which I answered, by showing him that his hasty perusal and misquotations had led him into misconception. This, he calls, 'abandoning my main ground.' He pronounces the Thomsonian theory destitute of truth,

opposed to reason, and absurd; but, until he brings at least one fact to prove these statements, I prefer his other statements, that 'bare assertions of men, without reason or argument, carry but little conviction to the understanding,' and I choose this, because it accords with facts and my own observation, to which the others are directly opposed. If my theory of disease, true or false, has been yet refuted or even understood by the Doctor, I am ignorant of the fact.

I now come to the 'curious and amusing portion of' his reply. He seems somewhat displeased at my not giving him the '*manutiae*' of the system. It is useless to teach minutiae to one who cannot understand a plain general principle. To his request to be released from the long ride to Richmond to learn these things at the Infirmary, I most cheerfully answer, yes; I am glad of any excuse to get rid of the obligation to instruct in the science of medicine, one whom I should first be obliged to follow through Webster's Spelling Book, Murray's Grammar, [he could not comprehend Horne Tooke, Cardell, Webster, Smith, &c.,] composition and punctuation; enough of arithmetic to know what proportion 'one half of the whole all put together' makes; '*manutiae*' which would cost me three years labor at least, before I could begin to teach him the grand principles of the unity of disease, and the beautiful science of curing it, by removing obstructions and restoring the healthy actions of the vital organs. The Doctor says, I related fifteen cases of measles in one family, which were cured without losing one, (I did not say they were in one family,) and then asks whether I would believe that he had seen twice that number in one family, cured without any medicine!—

I answer, it is quite probable, for the *vis medicatrix naturæ*, or healing power of the system alone, is generally sufficient to cure the measles. I should be much more disposed to doubt it, had he told me they were all treated *secundum artem*, by 'learned doctors,' as it is a very rare thing that so many escape the fatal effects of that kind of treatment.— Dr. Bigelow of Boston says, (and I agree with him) the principal business of the doctor in measles, is to prevent officious quacks from doing mischief.

After stating two cases by way of caricature, Dr. D. goes more seriously into the report of others which he says 'rest on authority of indisputable veracity.' The first two are cases 'sent by a young medical friend.' The third was a negro belonging to Mr. S.; another was Mrs. M., the wife of a steam doctor, and the physician was Dr. J.; a case was related by herself, Mrs. D. Another was Mrs. C. of M. County. These are followed by a case furnished by Dr. H. W. D., of F. County; another Mrs. S., of T. County, was given by the attending physician. Then comes Mrs. L., of M. County. Another is given by Mr. R., whose daughter, Mrs. P., had been killed by the steam Doctor, C. H. S. [Doubtlessevery man in Georgia knows all these characters!] Now, I might have put some confidence in the above statements, had not the same Doctor who made them [they all rest solely on Dr. Deloney's authority,] said to 'WARDEN' that 'the bare assertions of men, without reason or argument, carries but little conviction to the understanding;' and second, that 'a cause whose advocates are ashamed to subscribe to, is not worth notice.' That these reports are without 'reason,' I prove by the fact that they are given by persons who were not present to behold the scenes, symp-

toms and effects which they describe; they depended on Thomsonian patients and their friends, to describe things of which at other times they declare such persons wholly ignorant and incapable. They will not allow that the most skilful Thomsonian practitioner knows any thing about the diseases, symptoms or effects of medicines in the cases which he cures; but any testimony from any simpleton who, after commencing the practice and feeling a little strange, is frightened at the recollection of the horrid tales about the burning of cayenne and steam and the poisoning of lobelia, and returns to the regular practice, 'like a dog to his vomit &c.,' 'rests on authority of indisputable veracity.' Again; that the above cases are 'without argument' against Thomsonism, is proved by the fact that the treatment there described is not according to Dr. T., nor are the effects such as are observed in his practice.

But I am compelled to use another argument against Dr. Deloney in his review of the cases I cited in my lectures, viz: 'which cases we believe from good reasons never occurred. 1st, because he is vague and indefinite in the relation of every case: 2d. he neither gives the name nor residence of the patient, 3d. He does not state who the physician was [s were] that attended these patients and failed in their efforts to cure; thus leaving no clue by which the facts which he presumes to relate, may be investigated and the truth of them ascertained!' If Dr. D. will not accord to me the capacity to frame an argument for myself, I hope he will admit that I have turned to good account those which he made to my hand.

Having finished his reports of cases, the Doctor returns, [perhaps unconsciously from the force of habit] to his calomel and tartar emetic. He

says I 'seem surprised that calomel skould have so many different effects upon the human system, and not aware that tartar emetic will also puke purge and sweat.' The Doctor may be sure that none of these things surprise me; I am fully aware that the exertions the system makes to get rid of those poisonous drugs, often do cause puking, purging, sweating, and many other effects. I am aware of at least two other facts; first, that these exertions in strong constitutions, sometimes throw off both the morbid matter that caused the disease, and the poison which the Doctor gave with intent to cure; and, second, that when the dose is rather too large, *or too small*, or the constitution too weak to combat more than the disease, multitudes sink under the double influence of disease and poison, who might easily have conquered the former, had not the latter been added. If Doctor Deloney understood the *modus operandi* of sub. mur. hydrarg. [calomel] and tart. antim. [tartar emetic] as well as I do, I should almost as soon expect to see him administer the contents of a pistol or the blade of a sword, as these deadly drugs to his patient. That 'lobelia will puke or kill or kill if it pukes' I cannot be 'aware' until it is proved to be *true*.

After some 'floundering' like 'a shuck in a whirlwind,' (a beautiful figure,) the Doctor appears delighted to have 'come to something of a theory again,' and he enquires for the seat of life. Having excused him from coming to the Infirmary, I will just gratify him a little. While the heart and the ribs expand and contract, there is life in the body. It is by means of the process of digestion, absorption, circulation and secretion that life is supported; or, which is the same thing, that

the heart continues to contract and expand, and the lungs to inhale and exhale. This process of digestion &c., is commenced in the stomach. Any derangement in this organ is soon felt through the whole system. 'The stomach,' said Dr. Hunter, 'is the centre of sympathies.' Such derangement, therefore, may be properly called an obstruction to the free operations of life at the fountain. But, says the Doctor, 'what is life?' I answer, it is the impulse given to the organized body at its creation, by which means it is enabled to digest, absorb, circulate and secrete the substances exhibited for its sustenance; this Dr. D. calls the 'spirit and breath of the Almighty!' As well might he say that a life-preserver, inflated by himself, possessed a human soul, being animated by the 'spirit and breath of Dr. Deloney.' True the power of God effected it; but, as we do not say that a watch is propelled by elasticity, or a mill by gravitation; so we have no right so say that taste, mastication, deglutition, digestion, absorption, circulation and secretion, are carried on by the spirit of the Almighty! When Dr. Deloney's philosophy supplants all other, the springs and wells will no longer be the fountains of water, nor will even the the sun be the source of light and heat.—Indeed there will be no fountain in the universe but the "spirit and breath of the Almighty."

But he says my 'system is boldly charged as unfounded, and without principle, yet I cannot prove such charges erroneous' &c. This is putting the *onus probandi*, (the burden of proof,) on the wrong party. I thought the laws of honorable polemics, required the author of the charges to produce the proof, and should have waited in silence for the Doctor to produce his, had I not been aware



that he has none to produce. That day will be glorious to liberty, to truth, to the sacredness of a good name, when the bold charges of an ignorant and reckless accuser, are received as correct, till the accused shall prove himself innocent. It would be hard indeed if all the good people of Georgia were to believe me to be 'a *deceiver*,' a writer of 'tirades' of nonsense, studious to delude rather than to convince! an advocate of a system of medical practice which I know to be destructive to the health and life of its victims, merely because Dr. Deloney says so. How could I prove these charges false, were I to try? Two witnesses, EQUITY and WARDEN, have declared them unfounded; yet Dr. D. obstinately persists in them. When I made charges against the old practice, I proved them out of the mouths of its best authorities, and their own (not false and caricatured) accounts of the results of their practice. Let Dr. D. do the same with his charges against the Thomsonian, and I will admit their force.

The Doctor says to 'Warden,' lobelia *has been* used long before Thomson was *ever* heard of; and to me, 'it is well known that this article was known to the profession long before Thomson knew any thing about it.' Now, what I said about the medical use of lobelia, I proved by Dr. Waterhouse who says that 'Dr. Thomson has the honor of introducing the invaluable lobelia to the notice of the profession.' Dr. Deloney says, 'it was used (by the profession) long before Thomson was ever heard of.' If so, let him point us to the dispensatory in which it was recommended—this will close my mouth. He says, I acknowledged it to be poison, by saying that the Doctors did without sure and safe remedies before Thomson

was born; though I had not admitted that they knew any thing, good or bad, of the qualities of lobelia. Yet he never uses any unfair modes of reasoning.

The Doctor calls this system 'fallacious, deceptive, unfounded in truth and common sense, and contrary to enlightened reason.' He says 'it is made up of abusive terms and coarse, vulgar language towards the medical profession;' that I am 'a conceited puff,' and that my reply to him is 'a lengthy tirade of nonsense, in which I study harder to delude than to convince my readers.' (I did not know before that any one can be *deluded* till he is *convinced*,) and attempt to give a delusive cast to the true sense and meaning of his remarks; that the opinions of Drs. Waterhouse, Hersey, and Montgomery, who took lobelia themselves and prescribed it to others for years without measure or ill consequence, are of no value in its favor; but that the opinion of Dr. Coxe who tells of it what is not true, that if it does not vomit powerfully, it frequently destroys the patient, no one will dispute! Now, that the Doctor may be fully satisfied with my answer to all these bold charges, I will give it in his own words. 'The bare assertions of men without reason or argument carries [carry] little conviction to the understanding.' These must, then, be sustained by facts, arguments or reason, before the 'enlightened society' of Georgia, of which I know there is no small share, notwithstanding the dark specimen before me, will give them credence. I fear that the intelligent physicians of Georgia, will hardly acknowledge the Doctor as the champion of *their* principles, even though Dr. Smith of Boston has done it. I think he is in duty bound to excuse any miscon-

constructions which this reply may contain; for his punctuation is such that it is to me often very doubtful to which part of a compound sentence a given clause belongs. He has inserted but few periods, and most of them are between words connected by the closest ties of grammatical construction, as between the antecedent and its relative, the adjective and its noun, the nominative and its verb! while different paragraphs, and even reports of different cases of disease by different hands, are separated only by a comma, if by any pause at all! Though his bad spelling is not important to me, I hope he is more careful in writing his prescriptions; for Murray says, "In the use of drugs and medicines, the mistake of a letter may endanger life."

But why should I waste arguments with a physician who disregards all medical history, and the authority of the most celebrated schools in the world; who lays down no fixed course of disputation, and who considers 'bold charges' on his own side, conclusive arguments against history, philosophy, science and fact? He says,

'The testimony of the Edinburgh, London, Parisian, German, Philadelphian and Cambridge schools which I adduced to prove that the art of physic is a 'science of conjecture,' is contradicted by the experience of the whole medical profession, though that testimony *professed* to be the result of its best experience! He declares that lobelia is 'a poison of the rankest dye,' though there are in the United States, a million of the most respectable witnesses, among whom are physicians of the first eminence, that it has been taken a million of times, in doses of from five grains to half an ounce, without once producing the specific effect of poison! but,

on the contrary, with the most speedy and happy results in the cure of disease! I wonder he is not ashamed thus to expose his ignorance as a citizen, not to say his incapacity as a physician who ought to know of a medicine which he says he uses whenever there is occasion, at least whether it will puke or evacuate, kill or cure!

In his last paragraph, the Doctor "asks for light." I would cheerfully grant his request, but I am sorry to perceive that what I have already given him, has placed him in the condition of certain nocturnal birds, exposed to the meridian splendor of the sun. The brighter the light, the greater their confusion and terror. I gave him light from Drs. Abercrombie, Waterhouse, Rush, Lintaud, Good, and a host of other eminent heads of the profession; but he "puts down all this light for darkness" and brings forward the darkness of error for light.

The truth is, experience proves the Thomsonian practice the best that has ever been devised; that the rapidity of its dissemination is surpassed only by its happy results in the cure of disease, and that the mass of the most intelligent physicians refuse to contend against it; either because they know that such contention would no more arrest its progress than Dr. D's "shuck" would stop "a whirlwind," or else they rejoice to see something started at last, on which the benevolent and sympathetic physician can place some confidence, as an important aid in his exertions to arrest the progress of disease, and the destruction of the constitution by poisonous drugs; and they are only waiting to have full development of its excellence, to justify them in coming out boldly in its favor.

Many of my personal acquaintance are using the

remedies themselves with this intent. But I would respectfully inform them that the use of Thomsonian medicines, *on the false principles of the schools*, can never develope the excellence of the full, unadulterated Botanic practice. Come out boldly, and witness the results of the practice in the hands of a skilful Thomsanian; and you will soon have all the evidence you can desire, to justify you in the most strenuous advocacy of the new Practice.

Mr. Editor, I thank you for the politeness you have extended to me in this discussion. The course taken by my opponent has rendered it far less interesting and profitable than it might have been; still I am not without the hope that it will do much good. As Dr. D. *says he has* demolished all my arguments, I presume he will consider another attempt at the same service an act of supere rogation; and, as I am perfectly willing, without further argument, to turn the cause over to the jury, "the intelligent citizens," I suppose you will be troubled no further.

Very respectfully, yours,

A. CURTIS.

Columbus, Ohio, Oct. 30, 1835.

P. S. I have just received the 17th number of the Federal Union, in which "Equity" has so used up Dr. D. that you will perhaps think further notice unnecessary. While I thank Equity for his facts and arguments in favor of the Botanic System and against poison and phlebotomy, I will just remind him that, considering this kind of work in the Baltimore Lectures still untouched, I have contented myself with merely exposing the ignorance, impudence, and recklessness of Dr. D. whose "shucks in a whirlwind" it is quite unnecessary

for me further to notice. Had a pupil of ten years given me for correction a piece of composition violating so flagrantly the laws of orthography, etymology, syntax, prosody, rhetoric, logic, natural and all other philosophy, I should have required her to correct and copy it, before I would have condescended to read it. But, as elegance of composition is not always indispensable to conclusive argument, I have not said much against his "grammar."

---

During the progress of the discussions between Dr. Deloney and ourself, certain 'sharp shots' passed between the Doctor and 'Equity' and 'Warden.' 'Warden' introduced a communication from 'The National Intelligencer,' containing the opinion of Professor Waterhouse, and others, in regard to Samuel Thomson, steaming, lobelia &c., in which lobelia is considered not only not poisonous, nor steam, pepper &c., any way injurious to the sick, but that all are absolutely the greatest friends to health, and enemies to disease that the world has ever known. 'Against the opinion of Professor Waterhouse, based on experience, the inconsiderate assertions of Dr. Deloney [says Warden,] will weigh but little, especially as he has developed too much of his own material. I regret to say that he has presumed too greatly on the ignorance of his readers, and the incapacity of the friends of the Botanic System; but I shall be disappointed if, before the controversy closes, he repent not his disregard of authority and lament not his choice of an antagonist,' as well as a subject.'

To this, the Doctor sent the following furious reply:

MR. EDITOR—A writer over the signature of "Warden" in your last paper has arraigned me before the bar of Thomson for the remarks which I have thought proper to make on the steam system; but as the *intelligent people* are the jury to decide this question, I do not fear the result.—"Warden" is very much deceived if he really believes that I shall "repent" before this controversy closes. He will do well not to feed his hopes with so pleasing an idea. He perhaps may be disappointed and mortified too, and if his hopes has been highly wrought, that mortification will of course be more humiliating.

I discover in the tenor of his few remarks, that "Warden" has contracted that disposition to *abuse*, which seems to characterise the whole *tribe* of the Thomsonian disciples as well as the author; and this in fact is one of the main weapons of their argument, the *centre prop* of their system. It is easily to be discovered that all who become deluded with steam, seem to contract this very necessary accomplishment, of that system, very speedily. [Dr. D. never abuses! oh no, he and his brethren and their adherents, are all very polite and mild in their language and charges: They only say now and then, that "steamers are all murderers;" that we "scald or poison our patients to death;" that our "only motto is havoc and desolation," that we "all ought to be hanged without judge or jury or benefit of clergy;" that "they would ride one hundred miles to see us hanged, and give fifty dollars to see us dissected;" and, as one did, that we shall be "tormented in hell" for our "murderous practices," these are small matters in comparison to our abuse of them in saying that the means and



modes they use have a direct tendency to induce disease and destroy life. See note, page 105.—Ed.]

“Warden” wishes to disabuse the public of my assertion, that Lobelia is one of the *most drastic poisons* in the materia medica. What is said of the history of the article? Dr. Cox, whose authority no one, unless it may be “Warden,” will presume to question, says, “the effects of this medicine are extreme nausea and vomiting. It is probably one of the *most powerful* vegetable substances of which we are acquainted. If this medicine does not puke or evacuate powerfully, it frequently destroys the patient.” [These well known fibs were copied by Dr. Cox from Dr. Thacher, who took them from the common report that Dr. Thomson poisoned his patients with it; when, in fact, no person died under his practice.—Ed.] If “Warden” is any better authority than the above, he may probably succeed in disabusing the public of what I thought proper to assert on this head, but the gentlemen need not be uneasy. The public, before very long will have other facts and proofs placed before it, of the deleterious effects of lobelia and steam, which “Warden” may not like so well to encounter.

I am not desirous that lobelia shall be discarded from the materia medica, nor do I intend for Thomson or his disciples to *filch* it from its rightful discoverers and proper place. [Dr. D. must be very thoroughly acquainted with medical history—will he please to point us to the medical work printed previous to Dr. Thomson’s “Directions,” in which Lobelia is recommended as a puke?—Ed.] This medicine has been used long before Thomson was ever heard of, and Drs. Cutler, Drury and others speak favourably of it in some cases of dis-



ease. So far as lobelia is in question, I desire only to caution my fellow citizens against its use in the hands of those who know nothing of it or of the human system. [Amen, say we.—Ed.]

“Warden” is deceived if he calculates to draw me from the main subject. He no doubt would desire to do so.  *The theory of the steam system and the practice founded on that theory*, as laid down by Dr. Curtis, of Richmond, Va., is my text, and here I plant my staff.  [Well you may, Doctor; for it is the only medical theory and practice whose line of direction is far enough on any side, from the extreme of its base, to sustain the lateral pressure of even a doctor’s staff.—Ed.]—His few remarks and letters of eulogy which he has been pleased to append to them does not refute in the least any part of my arguments heretofore. *The bare assertions* of men, without reason or argument, in these enlightened times, carries but little conviction to the understanding. [True, Doctor. The reason why Thomsonians do not believe that lobelia is poison, that cayenne will burn, or that any of their practice is murderous, is because it is a “bare assertion of men,” not only “without reason or argument;” but, contrary to all “enlightened experience.”—Ed.] Drs. Waterhouse, Montgomery and Hersey have made mere assertions without the proof, and of course have produced no argument of the correctness of steam-system further than their say so. [They all had taken lobelia themselves and used it in their practice on others: But neither Dr. Deloney nor Dr. Coxe speaks from experience; for that would have taught them that what they have asserted is a downright libel on the properties of the article.—Ed.] Their extravagant praise partakes of the na-

ture of the steam infatuation, and easily placed in its proper light. We may, at some future period, notice these flighty aberrations, if nothing else is produced more weighty and more applicable to the text.

We have extended these remarks further than we intended. We should not have noticed 'Warden' at all. He has said nothing worth notice, and we should not have said thus much, but to inform the advocates of the steam system, that we cannot in future notice any communication which they may make anonymously. Men, who are, from the very nature of their principles, generally with steam up, are too much disposed to abuse, as instances, heretofore, shows, for me to undertake to keep up this discussion in the manner which "Warden" seems disposed to direct; and moreover, a cause, whose advocates are ashamed to subscribe to, is not worth further notice. I fear not my antagonist if I know him; and am ready to meet him on any ground he may take in this discussion. I will go further and say that I am willing to meet not only his own arguments, but all the letters and sayings of others which he may introduce, *but we must both keep to the text*. [Excellent advice, Doctor, for, if they were only to observe it, *your* arguments would forever remain unanswered. What, for example, has the story of the drunkard's sale of a medical book, or that about the mistake in joining the Frenchman's leg; what have the innumerable proofless assertions in favor of "science," and against "steam" and "lobelia," and especially what has the assertion, so often repeated, that you have "successfully exposed" our deception, and demolished our system, to do, in a discussion where facts and arguments, truth and reason, are professedly sub-

mitted to the decision of the "enlightened public?" Is the Doctor so stupid as to believe that the descendants of one who said, "poor as I am, the king of England has not wealth enough to buy me," will be bribed? or does he fear, notwithstanding what he has said in their favor, that his "intelligent Jury" are not sufficiently enlightened to make up the verdict without his assistance?—ED.]

In conclusion I must beg of you, Mr. Editor, for the accommodation of "Warden" to append to these remarks the following speech of Dr. Williams, delivered in the House of Representatives of Maryland. He will no doubt allow me the same liberty which he has taken, and I promise if he is willing also, not to trouble you with more than what we can say on the subject in future, unless it may be *something to the purpose, argument and not assertion*. [Good. Now for the *argument* that lobelia was used as an emetic, by regular physicians, before Dr. Thomson was born. The fact exhibited that it was so recommended in a printed book, would take the scales from our eyes. ED.] For our own part we feel fully competent, be our "*own material*" what it may, to refute all their doctrine, answer all their arguments, and overturn their whole system, if such it may be called. Then let these men come out openly, in *propria persona*; and we shall then see who gets "tired of the controversy" first.

EDWARD DELONY.

---

To this was appended Dr. Williams's speech, see the first article in this book, page 5.

'Warden' replies.

## TO THE EDITOR OF THE FEDERAL UNION.

Appended to the last piece of Dr. Edward Deloney, of Talbotton, Georgia, against the Botanic Practice of Medicine, including practitioners, lobelia, cayenne, steam-vapor, &c., appeared an extract of a speech made by a Dr. Williams, in the Legislature of Maryland. In reply to that extract, I must beg you to insert, in your paper, the accompanying rejoinder, from the pen of Dr. A. Curtis, of Richmond, Virginia, that those not conversant with the subject may have some means of judging. In consequence of the appearance of Dr. Williams's speech in the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, and the profession, by the editor, of being anxious to promote utility in the healing art, regardless of partisan results, Dr. Curtis sent it to that periodical for publication. But it was rejected by the editor, who thus proved that liberality and independence in promises are no test of sincerity. Subsequently it was forwarded to the Thomsonian Recorder, from which I have extracted it.

Dr. Deloney complains that I, in my former article, was *abusive of him*; that in general Thomsonians substitute abuse for argument; and that hereafter he will respond to no production appearing anonymously. As to the charge in relation to myself, he must pardon me for contending, until he shall have shown the reverse, that in that article not a sentence can be singled out to support the allegation; and, as respects Thomsonians, decending to the most captious and ignorant that can be found, it may be truly said that, as to abuse, they dwindle into novices when contrasted with him, and that aptitude for it is the only semblance of

ability evinced by him in his two vapid, petulant and vulgar tirades. His determination not in future to notice anonymous articles, is to me a matter of no regret; for advantage over him in controversy could administer nothing to my vanity, had I any to gratify. It is, however, after all, just the course that aspiring imbecility, under like circumstances, might be expected to tread. Having asserted that we owe our knowledge of the Scriptures to the Faculty's intimacy with Hebrew and Greek, that Thomsonians consider hogs' lard poison, that Thomson's theory is "as old as the hills," i. e. older than Adam! and many other absurdities in relief, it is not surprising that from so ponderous a load he should be desirous to escape—especially after furnishing conclusive evidence of his entire ignorance of one of the best authenticated facts connected with anatomy, and his divulging to schoolboy as well as pedagogue, that notwithstanding his spluttering about the importance of Hebrew and Greek, he is incompetent to apply the first rule of English syntax. But whether one anonymous writer, "Equity," on whom he uncerimoniously fastened, will quietly allow him to skulk from a controversy of his own seeking, time must determine.

WARDEN.

---

To the foregoing, was attached our answer to Dr. Williams, see page 19.

Dr. Deloney answers:

FOR THE FEDERAL UNION.

MR. EDITOR—With my due respects to "Warden" I must again renew to him, my settled de-

termination not to enter into a discussion with *anonymous* writers, but the spirit of his last remarks, alone, fraught with such bitterness of feelings as they are, would deter any civil disposed man from a notice of them, "Warden" has surely been using the Cayenne and steam too freely since he first made his appearance, which, instead of calming the already existing irritation and excitement of his system, have heated it into a feverish frenzy that may unless he is speedily cooled down to a natural temperament, cause a permanent derangement of his intellect. We do not wonder then, under the present state of his senses, that he has quit the subject of *steam* and turned into a discussion of the *rules of grammar*; nor are we surprised at the dimness of his vision, when he made us to say—"that we owed our knowledge of the scriptures to the Facultys intimacy with the Latin and Greek languages," if he will make his quotations from our remarks as they are, he will find them hard to answer.

As we understand that a part of the steaming process is as soon as the patient is heated up almost to the point of *bursting-the-boiler*, a flood of cold water is showered down upon him untill he is well dreanceed, we would advise "Warden" to take a *little cooling*, himself, but not too suddenly, however, as it might throw him into the situation of a fellow which we heard of not very long since, who became so hard and stiff by this process that he had to be laid on a fixment, something like a hog over a *barbacue pit* in order to soften him down to a more soople or moveable temper—

It may not be amiss to state here that Dr. Curtis' last article addressed to myself, is under re-

view and shall be answered shortly and effectually.  
Respectly &c.

EDWD DELONY.

---

Reply of Equity to Dr. Deloney's remarks, in  
pages 143—'4.

FOR THE FEDERAL UNION.

*To Dr. Edward Deloney.*

In introducing to the readers of the Federal Union, the two Lectures of Dr. A. Curtis, delivered at Baltimore, last autumn, I expected to take no part in the discussion which, I anticipated, they would produce, but looked for the development of information that might be useful to the people of our State as well as myself: for I was well aware that to the faculty belong many men wielding powerful pens who would scorn to distort facts whether auxiliary or hostile, and who are too magnanimous to desire the continuance of penal sanctions to exclude innovation from, and punish competition in, the profession they follow.—Unfortunately, such men, chiefly from delicacy, have maintained silence, and left the controversy to a member, who though his fate in the matter cannot affect them individually, is too light in intellect and deficient in knowledge to be entrusted with the defence of almost any cause. Indeed, sir, your appearance was a presage of defeat to the old school, and of easy triumph to the new. Your imprudent grappling with a powerful adversary has done more in adding to the popularity of the Botanic System, than any impartial man wish-

ed—than I was willing should be; for you have, in effect, left it presumptively ascendant in all its pretensions, while my object was limited to the removal from it of legal prohibition, that, without factitious aid, it, in the hands of the people, might rise or fall on its own merits.

Such epitome of facts being disagreeable to vanity, you would be apt to denominate it slander, were I to omit evidence. To preclude complaint, I proceed with the proof,

Deficiency in education you prefer against the Botanic doctors as adequate to disqualify them to manage disease. Yet you, a “regular *scientific* doctor,” have placed beyond discussion your ignorance of even the first rules of English syntax. [1] Therefore, sir, by your own logic, you are incompetent to exhibit medicine—are a quack—or have attached importance to frivolous accusation.—Let which will be true, your testimony yields to demurrer.

You object to their ignorance of Hebrew and Greek, and to illustrate the utility of these languages in removing sickness, contend that, to the labors of regular doctors [2] the community owes its knowledge of the Scriptures. Really, sir, such a compound of religion and physic contains too much of the grotesque for even the unblushing front of charlatanism to father. The impostures of the age afford no parallel, except the Mormon bible of Joe Smith. I am at a loss to imagine the quantity of impudence required to enable any man to give it the sanction of his name. That ability to read the Scriptures in the original is essential to the successful administration of drugs, is the superlative of nonsense; and that the Scriptures were rendered into Latin or English by physicans,



is in conflict with history—whether reference be had to the Vulgates, or the allusion be intended for the version of Wickliffe, or of Tindal, Coverdale and Rogers, that called the Bishops' bible or the one known by the name of James I. Yet, were Hebrew and Greek necessary to the removal of disease, how comes it that you, who, so far from being a classic scholar, are ignorant of the rudiments of English—how comes it, I repeat, that you dare *tinker* with the lives of your fellow beings, and by what right are *you* entitled to a license or diploma? If Hebrew and Greek be essential, you risk manslaughter as often as your practice exceeds the *dicta aqua* and surgical limits of Catalan barbers, drawing teeth and handling the lancet, for which, as you are not a classical operator, you ought never to charge more than half price. In relation to Hebrew and Greek you are most assuredly insincere or criminal—morally criminal, if they be requisite—if not requisite, you have attempted deception. To the one horn or the other of the dilemma, you must hang, as the arc is no place of repose. Your insincerity, however, is no problem. You have not to learn the fact, that many of the most successful regular physicians in Georgia affect no acquaintance with the classics. One of the most distinguished members of the Medical Board of the State, instead of pretending intimacy with the writings of Moses and Galen and the posthumous works of Paracelsus, in the original, is wont to boast of having been raised at the stilts of the plough; and well may he be proud of the avowal, his general practice suffering nothing in comparison with that of any other regular doctor in the country, and having, as surgeon, successfully operated in bronchotomy and in taking up

the carotid artery. You cannot mistake the individual to whom I allude, nor will he or any other man with whom I am acquainted suspect me of intending to flatter him. Here, then is evidence that a "regular doctor," without Hebrew, Greek or Latin, may, by dint of observation and judgment, raise himself to the head of his profession; while you, sir, furnish in your own person, a living monument of our Medical law's solicitude for life, and its fostering care of science, that a man without a schoolboy's proficiency in English, may stuff the sick with mineral and vegetable poisons, and coerce payment for the work of destruction.

Against the Botanic Physicians you urge their being unacquainted with the structure of the human body, intimating that on the locality of disease depends the selection of the remedy; and ask, "who ever heard of blood *returning* through the *arteries*?" The sanguineous system being in fact a compound circle, it may, so far as the course of the blood is concerned, be said to be without beginning or end, and that every vessel engaged in the process is relatively an abductor and a restorer as it *returns* and withdraws. To press this view would however be triturating your dullness in the mortar of metaphysics, a species of cruelty which I am, on the present occasion, unwilling to practise. The words *returning* and *departing*, used in connection with the red circulation, every tyro knows, refer to the lungs, unless some other parts be designated; because, in these viscera, the blood, after having become laden with noxious particles, parts with its carbon and azote and receives oxygen; and, thus revived, leaves them to repair the waste of parts continually going on. Now, sir, no one fact in physiology, rests on surer evidence

than that the blood *immediately returned* to these viscera, is *returned* by the pulmonic arteries.—The “regular doctor,” who, through the columns of a newspaper, has to learn this fact, is assuredly in no wise superior to the most ignorant “steam quack,” and ought to blush at the mention of physiology or the Medical law of Georgia, remembering that he is inhibited by the spirit, if not the letter, of that statute, and that consistency and honor demand his immediate relinquishment of bolus and lancet.

You also represent the Botanic Doctors as being prone to abuse, and leave your readers to infer that this failing is a defect occasioned by cerebral action, and incapacities them for the removal of sickness. If true, then you too are put under the ban by your own showing—unless “botanic system quacks,” “a system of practice embracing quackery in its fullest perfection,” “a system of ignorance that can never rise above the most groveling superstition and whose motto is havoc and desolation,” “philosophic fop,” “nonsensical jargon of the champions of steam,” “confab of the champion of steam,” “champion medicine of their quack system,” “we are *stumped* here,” “a *caravan* of them,” [Botanists,] “he *keeled* up,” “boiler burstED,” “obstructacles,” and more than fifty such like expressions, be intended as specimens of *your* materia medica.

But scurrility and abuse are not the worst symptoms betrayed by you as a writer. Your contempt of truth protrudes itself glaringly and disgustingly through its cobweb apparel. I shall not urge against you the assertion that Thomson’s theory is “as old as the hills,” though false, whether the creation of the *hills* be deemed as preced-

ing Adam or to be concurrent with the flood; for the phrase, as one of comparison, is indulged hyperbolically by the illiterate and vulgar, and I have no inclination to censure you for using the license of your caste. But, sir, you have no apology to offer for affirming that *hogs' lard* is by the Botanic doctors pronounced a *poison*—for that declaration you have no authority direct or mediate, and your motive for the fabrication is to be traced to the malicious intention of injuring those with whom *you* are professionally enabled to compete only by the penal sanctions of an oppressive and a slavish law. To the same feeling is also to be ascribed your denial that Professor Waterhouse has given any testimony as to the innocuousness of *Lobelia* administered as an emetic, though you had before you his letter, in which he declares it to be “more agreeable and efficacious” than ipecac, and that “he not only prescribes it to others, but he takes it himself whenever he has any occasion for an emetic.” After effrontery so unblushing, and utter recklessness of truth, the public certainly cannot attach credit to your statements nor award goodness to your purpose.

Having thus established, that, from paucity of knowledge, frailness of judgment and perversity of disposition, you are incompetent to testify in any case in which the reputation of the old or new school of medicine is involved, I should, were you not incorrigible, leave you here to gather prudence and modesty from your reverses, and a modicum of civility for your public intercourse with mankind. But you have evinced so much apathy for the personal liberty of our citizens, so much coarseness towards myself in making me a party to this controversy, and so much Hottentotism in regard to the

feeling of those who differ from you in professional matters, (though they are to be found in every station,) that justice demands and your own welfare requires that I should drive you into a position which permits no pervarication.

You declare, to use your tautological verbiage, that "*Lobelia is one among the most violent drastic and deleterious poisons in the whole Materia Medica.*" Without obtending the direct and positive evidence of Waterhouse against the hearsay and contradictory testimony of Bigelow, Coxe and Thacher, I propose that you and I test the character of *lobelia inflata* in a manner that will exclude the suspicion of insincerity from us both. I am the father of a male child that has not yet completed his fifteenth month. Now, sir, for the forfeit of five thousand dollars, he shall take internally, during six consecutive hours, an amount of *lobelia inflata* greater in weight than you dare take in like manner during the same time, of white hellebore, oxymuriate of quicksilver, nitrate of silver, or white oxyde of arsenic, or of croton oil (each minim of which to be rated as a grain) the kind being determined by lot, and precautions adopted to ensure the purity of the article and prevent the use of incompatibles, and at the end of nine hours *he* shall be *more free* from *preternatural* action than *you*—or, sir, should the fear of death from the articles I have designated overpower your sense of shame, I, substituting myself for my child, agree that you resort to tartrate of antimony, sulphate of copper, kermes mineral, scammony, gamboge, nitrate of mercury, red oxyde of quicksilver or elaterium, the kind to be selected by lot, and exhibited under such restrictions as shall prevent fraud. To obviate all excuses and

quibbling, it is right to advise you of five thousand dollars, for the purpose on my part, being now in the hands of the editor of the Federal Union, who is authorised by me to perfect the arrangements; so that nothing intervenes to establish your sincerity in relation to the *poisonous* nature of *lobelia inflata*, except the dread of your own medicines and an unwillingness to risk an equal sum of money. This is making a disposition of one part of the altercation, that cannot be misunderstood, nor with any semblance of honor or truth be rejected.

In thus offering to prove at the risk of my life or that of my infant, that you have misrepresented and slandered the character of *lobelia inflata*, I intend it to be well understood that I have not witnessed enough of the Botanic Practice to vouch that it controls one tenth of the forms of disease that Botanic Doctors affirm; but I have seen enough of it to know that *lobelia inflata* is *not* poison; that the articles used in the new practice act speedily without leaving any morbid sequence; and that in some shapes of disease, nothing, in current use by the faculty, is half so efficacious. On this account I am of opinion that the importance of life requires for it an impartial trial, and that it is a duty, which every man, possessing the means, owes to the community to rebut falsehoods calculated or intended to frustrate a fair investigation involving so much of human happiness and human misery, and also to assist in cancelling the Medical law in our statute-book, which, besides being oppressive and anti-republican in spirit, is the chief obstacle to a just conclusion.

I shall, therefore, sir, not on your account, but from respect for the people, scrutinize the only

question in reserve—whether the toleration by law of the Botanic Practice be consistent with the welfare of the community? The results, as to personal right and general health, as well as science and public liberty, are criteria. As by the repeal of the medical law, no man, against his inclination, would be obligated to employ a Botanic Doctor or discard a regular physician, but be left untrammelled to the dictates of his judgment, the private right of no person would be abridged nor aught exclusive conferred on the new practice, while science, which is only truth demonstrated, instead of being jeopardized, would be advanced; for investigation is both her parent and her pabulum. Nor could the gross of public freedom be lessened by it; because, in strictness, public freedom is the aggregate of personal liberty. Neither could health in general suffer by it: because our citizens, though mostly unacquainted with the *modus operandi* of drugs, are competent judges of the relative success of those who administer them, and would, in a short time, exclusively rely upon the services of that medical order affording relief the most speedy and durable. Instead of being detrimental in any of these respects, the abrogation of the medical statute must prove highly serviceable. It would be removing from our code a law furnishing a most mischievous precedent for the invasion of our liberties—a law as obnoxious to the spirit of our constitution and as monopolizing in its tendency as would be the establishment of a national religion and the extirpation of all dissenters—a law denying to the citizen the privilege of using the means he may believe the best calculated to snatch himself, his spouse or his little ones from the withering touch and putrescent grasp of death, and

compelling his or their surrender, without resistance, to the natural assault of the grim messenger, or by eating poison, present themselves suicides before their Maker—a law irreconcilable with science and liberty, and disgraceful to the legislative action of a free people. With the pencil of hyperbole I touch not the picture. The right of collecting being withheld from the Botanic Practitioner and the reception of fees by him made penal, no poor man of mind, skill and experience can devote himself to the Botanic Practice, and wealthy ones will not follow a pursuit at once so unprofitable and legally infamous. The patient, whatever be his opinion, has therefore only the alternative to either submit to his malady or call in a doctor of the order prescribed by legislators, nine tenths of whom are conversant with medicine no more than himself, and consequently no better qualified to select. This is a flagrant reduction of natural liberty, without producing any countervailing benefit to the community. It is therefore adverse to equity, hostile to justice, and in conflict with the genius of republican government, and is in harmony only with the iron-despotism of Asia and the bill of rights of central Africa.

The existence of the medical act operates on the public mind most perniciously against the faculty. Rapidly extending is the opinion, that they are legalized charlatans, who, without the ability to do good, are firmly intent on sitting, like an incubus, on the health and pockets of the people, producing extensive poverty and artificial disease, otherwise they would not be opposed to competition by men whom they represent to be impostors and whose practice they denounce as the offspring of ignorance and stupidity; and let me admonish



you, sir, that your pen has given it a fearful impetus. That the imputation justly embraces not a few, I apprehend is no slander; but it were gross injustice in me not to bear witness against its applicability to many. Many, *I know*, revolt at the thought of prescribing for a patient who is either distrustful of their ability to relieve, or who prefers other physicians. They understand the prostrating effects of distrust on the system through the imagination, and have too much honor and self-respect to relish the bread procured though the operation of a law forcing under their care reluctant patients. That legislative provision they view as derogatory to their independence as men and their skill as practitioners, and they desire its annulment that they may even-handedly encounter the new practice, the legislative proscription of which, they are aware, has secured for it much of the public sympathy. Their silence, in relation to the able productions of Dr. Curtis, is, in fairness, not ascribable to any sense of incapacity, but to a disinclination to enter into the controversy at a juncture which would imputatively make them, as auxiliaries, accountable for your ignorance and slanders, and from a consciousness that, as they cannot appear in the light of disinterested debators or witnesses, the reasons and facts they might adduce would be suspected as slanderous ebullitions intended to prejudice a rival order. Hence their anxiety for the repeal of the medical law—which would place the two schools on something like an equal footing, and bring the contest fairly to the minds and senses of the people. This is all the friends of the Botanic Practice ask—a consummation urged by reason, claimed by justice, and required by private right and public liberty, and es-

sential, let me add, to the sacred tenure by which life is held.

## EQUITY.

*August 17, 1835.*

[1] That you may not reproach me with the neglect of citing evidence, I present a few of your literary beauties:—"the *Thomsonians* it appears only *makes* use," [Vide Murray's Syntax, rule 1;]—"is the *name* and *effect* of mineral medicines,"—"the *progress* and *improvement* of reason *has*"—"our *reason* and *understanding* is not sufficiently enlightened," [vide Murray's Syntax, rule 2;]—"men of the most splendid genius *that has* ever lived"—"glorious *results* of medical research and truth, *that* now *beams*"—"generations of men, *which* pass into the shades of oblivion and is forgotten"—"*branches* *that* is to support"—"correct *principle* of medical *theory* and *practice* which now *prevail* and is found," [vide Murray's Syntax, rules 1, 2 and 5.] Can't you bribe the printer to shelter your literary fame by fathering your blunders? If not, would expedience not suggest that you proceed in an action of assumpsit against your alma mater, not from any sordid feeling, but to cause her to be hereafter more attentive to her alumni? A literary mountebank is no enviable character.

[2] "Our reason and understanding is (you say, speaking of the regular practice) not sufficiently enlightened to enable us to behold the beauties and excellence of the subject, which seem to mystify our ideas, and perplex and mortify our feelings. Many men in this situation, call smarter men than themselves 'fools;' because they have not sense enough to understand them; and thus we may account why it is that Thomson has so fre-

quently taken it upon himself to dub [to knight, to confer dignity] the MEMBERS of the MEDICAL PROFESSION with the very polite and genteel appellation of 'LEARNED FOOLS.' "

After floundering through three-fourths of a column of turgid assertion, metaphysics and aspersion, to establish the intimate connection of Latin and Greek with the removal of morbid action, you pursue the illustration in reference to Hebrew and Greek by enquiring, "is not the lecturer aware that the Bible, which has shed such blessings and benefits upon the world, was originally written in the HEBREW and GREEK languages; and does he suppose that Samuel Thomson or himself would have ever known any thing about the glorious promises that are contained in [not between!] the lids of that precious volume, if *some* of the LEARNED FOOLS, [*"members of the medical profession"* be it recollected,] as he is pleased to call them, had not been able to translate that book into plain English?" Though the verbosity be irksome, your meaning is sufficiently intelligible.

In consequence of many of the regular practitioners having insisted on the inseparability of a knowledge of the learned languages from the successful practice of medicine, Samuel Thomson calls them "*learned fools.*" Now you assert that if these "*learned fools*" had not been qualified to render Hebrew and Greek into plain English, neither Thomson nor Curtis would ever have known aught of the blessings of revelation, or in other words that the English Bible is a translation from the original by the regular doctors—and as this information is given in illustration of the necessity of knowing the learned languages in the management of disease, it is equivalent to assuming the

position or rather demonstrating the fact that disease cannot be cured without Hebrew and Greek. What naked impudence in a man unacquainted with the rudiments of his vernacular tongue—and to be addressed too, in the presence of the public, to an individual deeply versed in the ancient languages and familiar with the sciences moral and physical!

## EQUITY.

---

To the foregoing Dr. Deloney replies:

Since penning the above I have seen a communication over the signature of "Equity," this enraged writer appears to be entirely destitute of reason, refined sensibility, he never heard of, his furious spattering essay reminds me of the ferocity of a bengal Tiger, or the Hyena, an animal which feeds on human flesh, no wonder such a man would offer to set an *estimate* of five thousand dollars on the life of his only child, I should take him to be a *lusus naturae*, void of heart or soul, a steam doctor extra refined,

Only one assertion in his piece is worthy of notice, so far as gross ignorance and a feeble attempt at perversion, deserves notice, he wishes to induce a belief that I am ignorant of a physiological fact, which he says, every Tyro in medicine ought to know—and this fact is, that the blood *does return* through the *arteries*, I deny it again, the blood in *no part* of the system *returns* through the *arteries*, The heart is the centre and soul of the circulating system, and although the circulation is a "*compound*" one, yet it is the *action* of the heart which *propells* the blood through the ar-

teries to the extreme parts of the system whence it returns again to the heart through the veins. from thence it is again *propelled* by the *same action* to the Lungs, through the pulmonary artery, where its vital principle is renewed by the oxygen with which it there comes in contact, and again *returns* to the heart through the pulmonic vein, thence again to be driven out through the whole system,—the blood does not *return* to the lungs, it is *driven* there by the *action* of the heart, and it never would get there, were it not for this peculiar and essential action which propells it,

Thus much, without going into a history of the circulation of the blood, I have thought it proper to state, not for any respect which I considered due to “Equity” but to show his utter ignorance or his disposition to false reasoning—Thus it is seen that “Equity” is as ignorant of *physiological facts* as any other man would likely desire to be—With regard to that part of his remarks, relative to the action of the Legislature with regard to licensing the practitioners of his system, I deem it unnecessary to reply, abler hands than myself will scan that matter, and do it *full justice*.

I find nothing more in his article worth notice, like his coworkers he deals out fury and nonsense by the wholesale, *keeps off* from the subject, has never once said a word about the theory of his system or his plan of curing diseases, we wish our readers to mark this fact and if this controversy is continued by persons in their proper names, we intend to “keep them to the test,” “Equity” or “Warden” or any other *fictitious* writer will never receive further notice from us.

EDWARD DELONY.

Talbotton, Ga. Sept. 15th 1835.

The following is Equity's Farewell.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE FEDERAL UNION.

In appearing again before the public, allow me, sir, to express my approbation of the course you have recently adopted in permitting the articles elicited by the Medico-Botanic Practice to issue from your press as they are written, letter for letter and point for point. Impartiality and justice require it. Nor can Dr. Delony complain, although by its adoption, his *literary* pretensions have been sunk below the level of pupils' in infant schools. Having urged its being put into operation against his opponents to fix upon them his charge of ignorance, he cannot object to be adjudicated by his own rules of evidence. The test receives my hearty concurrence; and that all from my pen, presented for publication, be rigidly submitted to its action, harmonizes with my wish and expectation. I ask no favor from my publisher, except the use of his columns, when such indulgence accords with his convenience—a boon that I should neither seek nor accept, were his corrective skill or that of his youngest apprentice essential to the accuracy of my language.

Dr. Delony is extremely anxious that the names of the friends of the new practice be attached to their writings. I have several motives for declining. Having altogether relied either on reason or well-known facts, my name is unessential as authority. Nor am I covetous of the character of a scribbling gladiator. Besides, the kind of notoriety following an advantage over any person of his capacity and feelings, I should esteem as a disgrace. Moreover, having found me anonymous

and dragged me into the lists against my inclination, the *melee* is not the time for him to be indulged with the raising of my visor. And, last of all, from courtesy he is severed by his coarseness, malice, arrogance and deliberate slander. But he may rest assured that I have a name, and for what I say or write my person is responsible.

To the part of my last publication relating to the policy of licensing or tolerating the Botanic Practice, he reluctantly confesses his inability to reply, vaunting that it shall however be consigned for refutation to abler hands than his. Into weaker it cannot fall—into abler it must, should any advocate be found. But I cannot anticipate that any man of talents will risk his reputation, in debate, by espousing the affirmative of the question, Ought the citizens of a free country to be restricted by statute for aid, in sickness, to physicians whose chief remedial agents are known and acknowledged to be poisons? Genius and sophistry may achieve much; but so weighty a load they cannot carry. It would be as easy to maintain that the tenets peculiar to some religious sect should be legislated into our code to the exclusion of all others from our country.

The subject will probably attract the attention of our Legislature at the ensuing session. On it, should action be had, I hope that body will keep in remembrance that the faculty insist on what may be accepted as an axiom, that great skill is necessary in administering poisons for the removal of disease, while the Botanic doctors disclaim all knowledge of the management of such articles. To secure, therefore, to the former, the monopoly of such remedies, and to shield our citizens from the mischief they would unavoidably produce

in the hands of the latter, I respectfully suggest to the General Assembly to prohibit the exhibition of any metal or mineral, even iron or sulphur, or of any vegetable poison, by a Botanic physician, not barely under penalty of forfeiture of collection, but of confinement and hard labor in the penitentiary during a period not less than seven years.

But whilst thus sedulously preserving from invasion what properly belongs to the faculty, the rights of those indisposed to depend on instruments of destruction for the lengthening of life, should receive at least some respect. This cannot be accomplished by submitting the Botanic practice or the qualifications of those who pursue, it to the control or inspection or caprice of any board of regular doctors. It would be the same as consigning a man's life and reputation to a jury composed of prejudiced and interested enemies. Should legislative wisdom deem expedient the institution of a board for the examination of applicants to practise, such body ought to consist of and be selected by those who rely on and have experience in the Medico-Botanic remedies. They only are competent to decide as to the attributes inseparable from the management of their agents; and a convention of such citizens, under sanction of law, would be adequate to maturing all needful arrangements.

I would likewise remark that further delay by the Legislature, in the settlement of this momentous subject, is contraindicated by prudence as well as justice. More than three thousand "Family Rights" (as the patent-rights to prepare and use the Botanic remedies have been named) are held in the State of Georgia, and the demand for more is rapidly advancing. Allowing each right to em-



brace a family of five members, the number of whites relying on Botanic remedies would amount to fifteen thousand; but as several Botanic doctors prescribe for more than five hundred patients, and many for from fifty to one hundred, it is a moderate calculation to rate at twenty thousand the white citizens, in our State, wedded rightfully or wrongfully to the practice. Estimating one fifth of that number to be male adults, four thousand votes are shown, and the balance of power between our two political parties ascertained to reside in the believers in Medical Botany. I should deprecate the subject's being made a political question; and I am satisfied that many would, under no circumstances, assent to its becoming such. But I would be recreant to candor and truth, did I not express it as my conviction, that, unless they be emancipated during the approaching session, at least a moiety of them will vent their indignation at the polls. They are disgusted with that nominal freedom which leaves them disfranchized and denies them the supervision of their lives. Nor will their strength diminish. Independent of the simplicity and safety of their remedies, the very legal persecution under which they labor will acquire for them friends and converts. Wo to the party on whom their vengeance shall alight.

With esteem, I remain

EQUITY.

---

*To Dr. Edward Delony, of Talbotton, Ga.*

It is with surprise, sir, I perceive your egotism quailing before the *legal* part of my last communication, and consigning the answer to *abler hands* than your own, which is equivalent to saying that

the labor shall devolve on any individual fancying the undertaking. More credit would be due you, had you observed the same prudence with regard to the other items of discussion. The public would have construed your taciturnity into a recantation of your errors, and your ridiculous pretensions to science and literature would, on the withdrawal of your publisher's orthographical aid, not have shrunk into an ignorance rendering you a fit subject for an infant-school, in the lowest tables of monosyllables. But your evasions, malignity, fabrications and arrogance exelude you from the indulgence that charity is wont to extend to the aberrations of the simple and illiterate, and morality and justice require the exposition of your frauds, for the sake of example. I obey.

To the faculty's knowledge of the dead languages, you declared, we owe our English versions of the Bible. "Warden" denied it. By affecting that you had not advanced the statement, you pleaded not guilty. I established the charge by adducing your own words. Yet you have not dared to challenge or invalidate the evidence, but continue mute, probably hoping that the subject would not again be agitated.

As prerequisites to the exercise of the healing art, you affirmed, the learned languages to be needful. By quotations from your own pen, I incontestibly proved, that so far from being conversant with the classics, you are even unacquainted with the plainest rules of English syntax. The dilemma followed that either you are a quack or your assertion is untrue. I did not however, in the alternative, leave you an option, but selected the horn, by alluding to one of the most distinguished members of the Medical Board of Georgia that,

without owing aught to Greek or Latin, follows a practice, if success be a criterion, surpassed by that of no regular doctor in the State. Yet you have not the candor to acknowledge nor the boldness to maintain your error.

The Botanic doctors you accused of considering hogs' lard as poison. I pronounced the statement to be false, and demanded evidence. Yet the only defence you offer is that of a skulking mute.

You gravely averred that Professor Waterhouse has given no evidence in favor of the innocuousness of *Lobelia Inflata*. Making citations from his letter, (which I knew had recently been before you,) I charged you with deliberate misrepresentation. Still you deem a charge so serious as being unworthy of notice.

Not satisfied with the conflicting slander of *Lobelia Inflata* by Bigelow, Coxe and Thacher, you thought it meritorious to transcend them, and, in your tautological rant, to declare it to be "one among the most *violent drastic* and *deleterious poisons* in the *whole materia medica*." *Knowing* the assertion to be false, I so pronounced it; and, to expose your insincerity, to convince the public you had uttered that which you did not believe, tendered to you the forfeiture of five thousand dollars that one of my children, a male not quite fifteen months old, could take, in a given period, of *lobelia inflata* a quantity greater than you durst swallow of certain drastic medicines in the same time, under restrictions to prevent deception, and that, at the end of a certain number of hours, he would be freer from preternatural action than you—or, in the event of your recoiling from the articles specified, I, substituting myself for my child, was willing you should, under a particular mode of elec-

tion, take, one of certain articles named, which are daily exhibited by the faculty both in America and Europe. If lobelia inflata be, as you have averred, one of the greatest poisons in the materia medica, any one of the first class of articles, if taken by you, would be in your favor at least ten to one against my child, considering his age; and the second class taken against myself would give you a yet greater advantage. But this to you advantageous offer, with the pecuniary inducement of five thousand dollars, has been rejected by you, under the pitiful excuse that I have set a *price* on the *life* of my *ONLY child*. The price of life is, in common and legal parlance, the consideration received or to be received for the destruction of life. Now, by my proposal, I could receive no consideration or price in the event of my child dying or even if he should be as disordered as you at the expiration of the time mentioned, but you were to get five thousand dollars. Therefore, I was setting no price on the life of my son; but, like the declaration of his being my *only* child, it is another instance of your indulging a constitutional propensity. Nor was his life involved in the ordeal. Repeatedly has he (and always with indubitable benefit) taken of lobelia inflata an amount the equal of which of any article in the class first mentioned would, under the precautions to be stipulated, destroy the stoutest man on earth. Your accusation of my wishing to violate the sacred obligations of a father for a sum of money, therefore, resolves itself into the base excuse of a craven spirit, for declining a trial that would expose his want of truth and consign his carcase to the grave.

After furnishing such conclusive testimony against your respect for truth, and particularly in

relation to *lobelia inflata*, it is singular that you should be so tenacious in claiming the knowledge of its medical qualities for the faculty, before the birth of Samuel Thomson. How the confirmation of this assertion should detract from the utility of the Botanic practice, I am at a loss to conceive; but can very easily understand how the neglect of a remedial agent so potent ought, if known, to operate against the benevolence, candor and justice of the old school practitioners. I however apprehend that they are not responsible for the omission with which your indiscrete zeal would saddle them.—Had you authority, it would be paraded; and the absence of quotations indicates that in this, as in most other matters, you have consulted your *natural* encyclopedia. The earliest mention by a regular physician that I have been able to find of any remedial property being ascribed to *lobelia inflata*, is *said* to be in an essay of Dr. B. S. Barton, written in 1798 and published in 1800, recommending its *infusion* for the cure of Leucorrhœa; and, in 1802, Coxe, apparently on Barton's authority, advises the same preparation to be exhibited in the same form of disease. It was not until after the trial of Thomson, in 1809, that its violent and baneful effects, with its *empirical* use, were trumpeted in the American Dispensatories, nor was it until after the commencement of that trial that the Rev. Dr. Cutler's knowledge of its power in controlling asthma was made public—seven years subsequent to the commencement of Thomson's administration of the plant in most shapes of disease incident to the climate of New England, during part of which time Thomson practised with it in the immediate neighborhood of the Rev. Doctor. Whether Thomson's knowledge of its vir-

tues was derived from the aborigines, or, by accident, he, in 1773, discovered it to be emetic, is a question that chiefly relates to the person of Samuel Thomson, and cannot affect the results of the plant as to good or evil, in relation to its power over derangements of the human system—which question I leave to the research of those more interested than I am in its solution. Upwards of two millions of whites in the U. States, of whom more than fifteen thousand reside in Georgia, use no other emetic than this slandered plant, and the increasing demand for “rights” and Botanic remedies, bears ample testimony that the practice is not retrograding. I will conclude this point of the controversy by reciting the evidence of Dr. Beach, of New York. “Lobelia is a very valuable plant, containing many active medicinal properties. It is stated that it was first used by the aborigines of our country; but we are indebted more especially to Dr. SAMUEL THOMSON for bringing it into use. \*\*\*\*\* The charge brought against it by many physicians, is totally false. I have used it for many years in various diseases, both of men, women and children, in which I have never seen a single unpleasant symptom arise from its administration.”

In relation to red pepper, as I am satisfied of your limited research, I shall not refer to its general use in sickness and in health throughout the Ex-Spanish colonies, of inter-tropical America, nor yet to its antiseptic and alexipharmic reputation in the English Antilles, but to the portion of our country bounded by the Sabine and Savannah rivers. In this extensive tract, it is, among the laboring people, the common remedy for catarrhal affections. Now, if the acute form of this disorder be, as the faculty insist, of an inflammatory na-

ture, the sequence is, that red pepper is not contraindicated in inflammation—unless, indeed, you contend that, in consequence of being ignorant of the medical experience of three thousand years, the most valuable part of our population have no right to credit the evidence of their own senses, nor be allowed the guardianship of their own lives. Again, sir, it is presumable that you have heard of yellow fever, the *typhus icterodes* of nosology, and that, at Savannah, it raged, with fearful mortality, in the year 1820. Dr. Wm. C. Daniell, who was then and is now a resident of Chatham county, practised extensively during its continuance. If his evidence (which he shortly afterwards gave to the world) may be relied on, he found the mercurial treatment wholly unavailing, his patients dying before calomel would act. Suiting his practice to the emergency, he exhibited cayenne and serpentaria, applying to the surface sinapisms at the same time; and, under that change, he states, success attended. Here, then, is proof of its utility, not only in ardent diathesis but also in direct debility:—and, let me add that a member of the Medical Board of Georgia, whose general practice yields to none in the State, has, if I am not deceived by individuals the least likely to misrepresent him, administered it, with no sparing hand, during the present season, and has not failed to raise one patient for whom he prescribed it. So the Botanic doctors are not alone sinful of giving red pepper. But what avail any facts, when opposed by the *ipse dixit* of Dr. Delony?

It may now not be out of place to enquire whether the application of the steam vapor bath be not sanctioned by the usages of several nations, as well as distinguished physicians ancient and

modern, and if the use of cold affusion, immediately after such bath, be not practised with impunity, and also whether principles, recognized by the most distinguished practitioners, do not authorize the immediate but temporary application of cold to the human body after its exposure to caloric combined with moisture. In his third lecture, [*"Treatment of Inflammation."*] Sir Ashley Cooper, after illustrating the *sedative* effect of *continued* cold, states that *sudden* but *transient* exposure to *severe* cold is highly *stimulating*. By plunging his bare arm up to the shoulder into snow, his pulse, which was before eighty, immediately rose to one hundred and nine. After having closed the consideration of the cold bath, he proceeds,

"The next mode of relieving inflammation by local remedies, is by the application of heat with moisture; this appears like contradiction; apparently opposite causes are used to produce the same effect, and it seems to be blowing hot and cold with the same breath; but it is so. The application of heat alone would be injurious, by increasing action; but, when combined with moisture, it is beneficial, by producing relaxation, opening the cutaneous pores, and giving rise to perspiration; thereby removing congestion, and producing effects nearly similar to those which arise from the application of blisters. The effects of heat and moisture combined, are well exemplified by what happens when a person takes the warm bath; for instance, a person whose pulse is at 75, places himself in a bath, the water of which is heated to 100; his pulse soon rises to 100; presently he perspires freely; his pulse becomes less frequent, but soft; great relaxation follows, and, if he were not removed he would faint, so great is the exhaustion



it occasions. Here then is direct proof of what heat and moisture produce, when applied generally; and when used locally, the effect on the part is precisely the same."

If then heat and moisture, combined, open the cutaneous pores and force perspiration, the expediency of applying heat with moisture, in even inflammatory forms of disease, is manifest; and, as the process is followed by great relaxation, the stimulant effects of the sudden and short application of cold are called for by common sense and sound philosophy. Hence it is evident that the principles laid down by one of the most eminent men of his age fully sustain the use of the hot vapor bath and cold affusion as applied by the Botanic Doctors.

Indeed, that distinguished character seems not to be altogether unacquainted with the benign effects of aqueous vapor. In his second lecture, speaking of what he calls "irritable inflammation," in which "the blood vessels are much less affected than the nerves," he observes, "some time ago I was consulted by a lady who had this painful affection in the foot, and I employed various remedies without her being relieved; finding no improvement, and suffering in health, she went to the coast, and there used a steam bath; and, without any further means, the pain quickly subsided."

But the efficacy of steam vapor does not, among the members of the faculty, depend on the principles or evidence of Sir Ashley Cooper alone. If you could, as you most ridiculously wish the public to think you can, read Greck, you would find that Hippocrates sometimes recommends the vapor of hot water; and, were you as attentive to medical

history as you are to pasquin and low jest, have ere now learnt that Aretæus and Gabius were deeply impressed with the utility of the steam vapor bathing; that Boerhaave, Mudge and Peter Frank were its advocates; and that, during the lapse of the last twenty-five years, it has found zealous supporters and panegyrists in Andria, Assalini, Blegborough, Chaussier, Clark, Cochran, Curzio, Gales, Gibney, Jurine, Macartney, Marcard, and Murray.

Such authority might, one would think, be sufficient to calm the apprehensions of a scribbler, who believes in the infallibility of the three-thousand-years fraternity, as to the consequences of steam vapor. But, sir, its character rests not on the opinion of isolated individuals, however blest with genius and versed in science. The Neapolitan government, with a beneficence that somewhat redeems its despotic structure and onerous action, provides indigent invalids with the means of transportation to, and maintainance at, the natural steam vapor baths on the island of Ischia; and almost every schoolboy has heard that, in Muscovy, not only each hospital but every prison is furnished with baths of steam vapor, in which the bathers are exposed to a heat of from 122 to 133 degrees, and, at the expiration of half an hour or of an hour, uniformly undergo the operation of the cold affusion. In Lapland, Norway, Sweden and Finland, as well as in Russia, it is indulged in freely and almost daily by all ranks of people. In the narrative of his journey to the North Cape, Acervi states, that the Fins not unfrequently remain a whole hour in it with the heat raised to 176 of Fahrenheit, and, naked, walk out into the open air as low as 24 below zero, in which condition,

without the least inconvenience, they assist travelers in harnessing and unharnessing, and fetching provender for horses. I might also refer to the high estimation in which the steam vapor bath was and is still held for the recovery and preservation of health in Persia, Egypt and Turkey; but shall restrict myself to citing the reasons, advanced by Dr. John Bell, lecturer on the Institutes of Medicine and Medical Jurisprudence in Philadelphia, why exposure to cold, immediately after being in the steam vapor bath, is attended with impunity, thinking it appropos to inform you, at the same time, that he is no admirer of Botanic doctors.

“The higher the animal heat, the greater is the power of resisting cold; and hence in the present case the highly excited state of the skin, it being both red and hot, enables it to bear with impunity the sudden application of cold water and snow: just enough of its heat is lost by the change to establish a pleasant medium temperature. It would follow, therefore, that the naked Russian is enabled to roll in the snow without injury, precisely because he has just come out of the excessively hot medium of the vapor bath; for, had his skin been of the common temperature and ordinary sensibility; or had he waited until this part had become cool, and in that state of indirect debility following excessive excitement, it could not, any more than the internal organs with which it so closely sympathizes, have tolerated the great reduction of temperature and sedative operation effected by cold. An inhabitant of the north makes, by a stay in hot vapor, a sudden indeed, and excessive, but not less real preparation for meeting without injury intense cold, similar to that which he has more

gradually and habitually made in keeping up his animal heat by means of hot stove rooms, a clothing of furs and woollens, and full diet."

Now, sir, the only corollary, deducible from the foregoing in connexion with your positive assertions, if supposed to be true, is, that, in the hands of English, Scotch, Irish, Dutch, German, French and Italian doctors, the steam vapor bath is a powerful agent in the removal of disease—that when applied by semi-barbarous Persians, Turks and Egyptians, it is productive of good results—and, when followed by cold, whether moist or dry, among the rude Laps, Norse, Fins and Russians, or the more polished Swedes, it acts in harmony with life and philosophy—but, when used by Botanic physicians, it becomes a fell implement of death, and ought to consign the operators to the gallows.

But it is not perhaps against the separate use of lobelia and pepper and steam vapor, but their results in combination, that you are anxious to direct the prejudice and abhorrence of society. This inference derives probability from the tenor of the statements or certificates or vouchers (I know not to what class they properly belong) which you have chosen to array against the Botanic practice. Not one of them particularizing the agent that did the mischief, the conclusion arises that it is attributable to the aggregation. But unfortunately your evidence is rather defective. None of your witnesses gives his own name or that of the patient or that of the Botanist or that of the regular physician—not even the name of the neighborhood or county is developed, so that the very occurrence of the circumstances detailed depends on the uncertain veracity of Dr. Delony. Nor is

that the only suspicious characteristic. One of the cases is entirely irrelevant, and two at least, so far as the Botanic practice is concerned, bear *prima facie* marks of falsehood. One of the patients you represent as a female, who becoming (as many at first do) alarmed whilst over the vapor bath, unintentionally thrust her foot into the hot water, and therefore declined the completion of the process. Were you endeavoring to bleed in the toe, and, by the involuntary starting of the patient, your lancet to be brought in contact with the thigh, and the femoral artery were divided, would the accident prove that venesection generally endangers life, or that you intended to operate on an improper part? If not, how then can the scalding of the lady's foot affect the standing of the Botanic practice? In another case, mention is made of muriate of soda being administered. No individual, that has attentively read the books of the Botanic Practice or even of Botanic periodicals, can believe the story; for, with the exception of water and caloric, every article allowed in the practice consists of organic matter or preparations from it. In yet another case trumpeted by you, a something which you call "*Ambear*" was exhibited by a Botanic Doctor. Having charged my memory with the several species of *Bears* which I have seen or of which I have read, without recollecting any *Bear* with the prefix "*Am,*" I surmise that allusion is had to the provincialism *amber*, which means, in rustic parlance, the decoction of tobacco, *decoctum nicotiana*, probably on account of the color. But unluckily for your credit and that of your informant, if he exist, tobacco is placed by Thomson in his list of vegetable poisons, all of which he PROSCRIBES, and the violation of this prescript

would procure the expulsion of a member from any Medico-Botanic society in the United States. Tobacco is a narcotic, emetic, cathartic, diuretic, expectorant, sialagogue and errhine, in the old school practice, but finds no favor in the new.—Muriate of soda, in your materia medica, is designated as a cathartic, and, if accounts be true, has, in cholera asphyxia, been tested as an emetic, by members of the faculty, but has as yet been, and will very probably be, neglected by their rivals. These considerations must cause your tales of horror, until authenticated, to be viewed as the *sublime* creations of your *beneficent* fancy.

The testimony of Waterhouse and of some other respectable regular physicians (which has already been laid before you and the people of Georgia) would, were you influenced by common sense or common decorum, have deterred you from trafficking in contemptible and invidious slander; but your propensities are too deeply rooted to be altered by reason or repressed by shame. For the attention of the public, and not to benefit you, I extract, from an article published in the *Transylvania Journal of Medicine*, and written by Drs. Brown and Saunders, the following passage as bearing on the subject referred to by your nameless witnesses.

“Many of the followers of Dr. Hamilton, transcending his instructions, tolerate only one kind of critical discharge, and aim to force a monopoly of such evacuations to the bowels; continued mercurial purging produces a preternatural determination of the fluids to the liver and bowels, which, by long continuance, become congested. Long continued purging of any kind produces preternatural centripetal determination, and indirect debil-

ity of the bowels. Under such treatment, the patient's stomach and tongue are parched and dry; he is unable to sleep; extreme irritability and a train of nervous symptoms supervene. He is worse after each successive purging, until at length (*unless Providence should send a steam doctor to the rescue*) the case *terminates* under the name of biliary congestive fever; the biliary evacuations, the nervous symptoms, and the congestion being all manifestly the effects of excessive purging."

This is saying much. In prostration, produced by cathartics, the patient dies—unless, not a regular physician, but a steam doctor comes to the rescue. But evidence more to the point, may be had less remote. The Charleston Courier of the 28th ult. contains the following notification:

"*To the public.*—Having for some time past turned my attention to the *Botanic* or *Thomsonian System of Practice*, and having had an opportunity of witnessing its efficacy and promptness, in removing disease, I have no hesitation in avowing my conviction that it is a *practice safe, simple, certain and expeditious* in *all curable cases*, and therefore promising the most lasting benefit to the human family. Under this solemn conviction, I deem it my duty to *adopt* it as *MY practice hereafter*, and I hereby notify my friends, and all others who may be disposed to rely upon the judgment which I have thus *deliberately* formed, that they may command my services, at any time, by applying at my residence, southeast corner of Smith and Montague streets.

THOMAS EVELEIGH, M. D.

Charleston, September 24, 1835."

Believing the opinion of Drs. Brown, Saunders and Eveleigh, to be, with the unprejudiced,

of more importance than your ignorant and rancorous accusations, backed by perhaps spurious and at all events anonymous evidence, I shall proceed to contrast the sentiments of several distinguished men belonging to the faculty in relation to calomel, (*submuriæ hydrargyri mitis*,) with your panegyric of it. You say,

“In the first place, it will purge your stomach and bowels of all ‘obstructions’ and acrid collections, and that effectually and salutary [!]  
—it will control the excited and unequal action of the system and produce a general equilibrium in all the secretions—it will ‘open the pores of the skin’ and remove fever—it will give strength and tone to the general system—it will control the inordinate action of the liver, and regulate the secretion of the bile—it will curb and reduce inflammatory action in the circulating system, and it will stimulate this same system and add impetus to its circulation—it will promote digestion, because it has the power of removing the cause of indigestion.”

If I understand the compound sentence “it will control the excited and unequal action of the system and produce a general equilibrium in all the secretions;” it comprehends every disorder to which mankind have been, are, or can be subject. Consequently calomel is indicated in and adequate to every case, and nothing, not even a knowledge of the alphabet, is requisite to constitute a regular doctor except possession of a large stock of calomel. But of this *catholicon* Dr. Cheyne expresses some distrust, when he says, “it does not appear to be generally known that mercurials actually produce jaundice;” and Chapman of Philadelphia concurs with him. “For several years I have (says the latter gentleman) taught in my lectures,



that the extravagant employment of mercury by many of our practitioners, in autumnal fever, and other diseases, must be assigned as one of the causes for the general prevalence of chronic hepatic affections in some portions of the country."—Speaking of yellow fever, Dr. Chatard observes, "I cannot believe that this remedy [calomel] possesses any specific power in this disease, *as mercury*; for, by dissolving the fluids, it co-operates with the deleterious and decomposing cause of the disease, to destroy the principle of life." Hamilton, of Edinburgh, remarks, "among the numerous *poisons* which have been used for the cure of diseases, there are few that possess more active, and of course *more dangerous* powers than *mercury*." In relation to the effects of mercury on the nerves, Benjamin Bell states, "in some, temporary delirium takes place; in others, palsy or epilepsy supervenes; and in many, the memory and judgment are more or less permanently impaired. Instances, too, have occurred, where sudden death has supervened, apparently in consequence of a very trifling exertion or agitation." Sir Ashley Cooper affirms that "mercury will inflame the periosteum to a greater degree than the venereal disease itself." To it Pearson attributes *erythema*, an opinion corroborated by Coxe and others; and few persons are to be found who have not heard of *mercurial nodes*. The Parisian school have discarded it from their practice—Chapman asserts that it can be dispensed with even in the removal of syphilis—and John Bell of Philadelphia endorses the fact, remarking, "experience now satisfies us that for the *cure* of syphilis in its *various* stages, we may rely on these adjuvants [sulphurous fumigations and the vapor of hot wa-

ter] to the *entire exclusion* of mercury." Is such authority to be rejected at *your* bidding? But Bichat, in behalf of the faculty, exclaims, "at present we are all groping in the dark ;" and you are haply willing to have the expression pass as a truism, except in relation to Dr. Edward Delony.

You deny that the blood *returns* to the lungs by the branches of the pulmonic artery; because the momentum of that fluid is derived from the heart. You forget however that the action of the latter is mechanical, but that of the pneumatic viscera, vital; and that if a point of departure more important than another exists in the circle, it must be that at which the blood becomes fit for nutrition, the lungs, and that it cannot *return* any other way than by vessels that bring it immediately back to that point of departure. Every tyro in physiology knows that the blood *departs* from the lungs by the pulmonic *veins* and *returns* to them through the branches of the pulmonic artery. *Vide* Bell, Richerand and Majendie.

You affect, sir, to be superlatively elate that *I* have not obtruded *my* theory on the public, and are rapturous in my *not* attempting to defend the doctrine of *heat* being life. My theory, if its expression may be pardoned to gratify the craving of a mendicant wrangler, is, that disease is debility direct or mediate, and that, in all cases, it is attended by a diminution of the aggregate of vital heat. Consequently I cannot rely on antiphlogistic remedies. Yet I do not sanction the opinion that "heat is life," if for no other reason than that roasted potatoes never vegetate, and that boiled eggs cannot be hatched. True it is that Samuel Thomson has said "that life is heat;" but it is

equally certain that he has contended, to use his homely language, that "perfect health arises from a due balance of temperature from the four elements," which indicates only that a certain amount of caloric is essential to the healthy operation of the animal machine, and leaves it a legitimate inference that heat's being life is a figurative expression conveying the same meaning.— In fact, it appears to be no more than equivalent to Sir Ashley Cooper's assertion, that "*all the actions of the body are excited and sustained by internal and external impressions; as the blood is the stimulus to the blood vessels, the bile to the intestines, and heat, in a certain degree, to the whole system.*" But if Thomson, presumptuous from the success of his practice, attaches to the sentence a literal signification, and so confounds life with heat, as Baglivi did the former with the *dura mater*, Haller with the medulla, Hoffman with the nervous fluid, Darwin with the sensorium, Brown with the excitability, and Richerand with the result of organization; know then that I reject the sentiment with contempt, and that, so far as my information goes, no intelligent Botanic practitioner, unless it be Samuel Thomson, believes it. In him, as the people of this country, during the Revolution, did with respect to Thomas Paine, the Botanic doctors value what they have found to be useful, but nothing more. Had you, sir, been half as industrious after truth as you have been zealous to collect and concoct slander, and, with the orthographical aid of the Printer's devil, to impose yourself as a man of science on the people, against the Botanic physicians, a charge so preposterous you would not have ventured. In his reply to your rude assault, Dr. A. Curtis was, on

this point, sufficiently explicit; and, in the Thomsonian Recorder of the 29th of August last, he took occasion to say, "while a man is alive, the application and accumulation of heat will increase the vitality of his body, till the proportion becomes too great, when life will as certainly recede and finally depart, as if the heat were altogether withdrawn, \*\*\*\*\*." Life, then, is something different from heat or moisture, or both united."

Yet, sir, did the Thomsonian doctors indulge the belief that "*heat is life*," would their theory be more irrational than yours, or amount to the centesimal part in repulsive arrogance and loathsome blasphemy? What man that respects the understanding of his species or that reveres his Maker, would, under his own signature, venture to assert that "*life IS the divine spirit of our Creator*," the Almighty God, not in a figurative but literal sense? If God is a spirit, and that spirit be animal life, then *you* are a divinity or part of the Divinity, and, as such, may indefeasibly claim divine honors; and, by parity of reason, the vilest reptile that crawls is entitled to the same reverence. On the same principle, you may demand for your cook wench the worship of not only the inhabitants of Talbotton, but of the universe. Your definition is not however limited to animals, but embraces vegetables: for *life*, you tell us, *is the divine spirit of our Creator*; and every thing that vegetates, we know, has life. Hence the destructive exhalations of the machineel and the pernicious touch of the rhus vernix are emanations of God, and demand our gratitude and love. Again: if life be literally the spirit of the Creator, as you have it, in what an imbecile and inconsistent light does the very existence of the medical profession

pourtray the Being whose will is might and truth and immutability? Dr. Delony, bleeding and nauseating and purging a patient laboring under synocha, is, according to your explication, nothing more nor less, than one part of the Omniscient and Omnipotent Spirit, aided by the lancet, antimony, and quicksilver, endeavoring to assist another part of the same all-wise and all-powerful Spirit, in retaining its precarious possession of a temporary tenement against the assault of a something called inflammatory fever. Such are a few of the direct and unavoidable consequences of your favorite theory—a theory transcending Hindooism and Shamaism in abomination, and, to the letter, covering all the arrogance, blasphemy and wickedness of the Pantheism of Orpheus, John Toland, Vanini and Spinoso. A victim to what fatuity must be the man (if it be not a libel on human nature so to class him) who, to glut his vengeance on his rivals in his own profession, plunges himself into the gulf of heartless and hopeless atheism! Does *his* testimony merit credence? By *what* cord is *he* bound to truth and justice? It shall be my province to note his aberrations and apply the remedy.

EQUITY.

---

The following is supposed to be Dr. Deloney's "final bow" to the Thomsonians and the steam system:

FOR THE FEDERAL UNION.

*Mr. Editor*—As the Legislature of the state of Georgia, is now on the verge of its assemblage and as there will be many measures of importance and

many no doubt of frivolous import brought before that honorable body, I deem it not unimportant to make a few remarks on *One* which I presume will be forced upon its consideration,

For the safety of human life, so far as human means guided by science, experience and correct principle can make it safe, and to prevent or counteract the baneful influence of Quackery—the Legislature of the state of Georgia, and I believe of almost every other State, has enacted (and most wisely too) laws for the purpose of regulating the practice of medicine, so far as to confine it to men, who shall be found competent, by a sufficient board, of enlightened medical gentlemen to practice in the healing art, this is a wise policy, and is well calculated to prevent the destructive effects which would be entailed on the human family, were such superstitious and murderous pretensions, as those of the celebrated ignoramus, Samuel Thomson and his deluded followers, suffered to stalk at large without legal restraint—we find from History hundreds of years back, that the science of medicine was frequently annoyed with the pretensions of mountebanks, Quacks &c, but as often has the good sense of the enlightened class of community frowned it down and it soon recoiled back to the degraded source from whence it emanated, sometimes however, not without leaving behind it marks of its horrid effects among that class of community which its bold audacity was calculated to delude.

Among a certain class of society, far below that of the industrious labouring yeomanry of the country, hundred may be found who, too lazy to earn their bread by honest labor, too ignorant to pretend to the investigation of scientific principles and

the truths resulting therefrom and too degraded in their character to care ought for the risk of sinking it still lower if possible, by any effects which might result from an ignorant *lampering* with human life, ready and willingly grasp at any thing, no matter what the consequences may be, however shocking to humanity, that may seem to afford them the least prospect of a scanty gain, so it is gotten without labour, no matter how illy done, it is all well with them, and this may fully account why all such pretensions in all parts of the world, so readily meet with advocates, as reckless of character as their cause is of truth,

But were the effects of such impostures confined to the class of society among which they generally originated there would likely be not much cause of regret, but many honest and industrious people are unthoughtedly lead into the destructive snares of the bold and audacious Quackere they are aware of the danger of their situation, they feel the severe smart of their easy credulity.

Let the Legislature of Georgia mark the shocking results which have already transpired, the effects of steam quackery, the perfect laberinth of ignorance with which this system is involved, founded in falsehoods as it is and perfectly destitute of the least vestage of reason or common sence, is enough to induce any enlightened man to withhold from it the least countenance, and to frown indignantly on its deluded advocates—

But we need not express any fears on this head, the assembled wisdom of Georgia—Knows too well the interest of her people, value too highly, the lives of her citizens, and set too high an estimate on the benefits of science—for us to undertake to point out to her the path she should pursue.

MEDICUS.

The following closed the Georgia controversy:

FOR THE FEDERAL UNION.

## STEAM QUACKERY.

*To the General Assembly of Georgia.*

You have already seen, gentlemen, what my hopeful son, Dr. Ned of Talbotton, whom you all know by his "thare," "whare," "ware," "tharefore," "wharefore," "boath," and other orthographical eccentricities—has, both under his own name and that of "*Medicus*," advanced against this detestable innovation. Aware that some of you not only employ steam quacks in your families, but also steam yourselves, and eat lobelia, astringents and red pepper, it follows that I cannot expect that you swallow his fibs as truths, or credit the conclusions he draws from them; nor is it to be anticipated that the public will confide in them while thousands of such certificates of persons in *esse* as these are ready for the press.

"*Georgia, Walton County.*—This is to certify that my negro boy was afflicted with asthma, from infancy; on account of which I applied to physicians of various parts, but to no purpose. I then applied to the *Thomsonian System of Medicine*; and *lobelia* has so far cured him, that he has had but one attack of the disease in two years. This I consider sufficient to convince any reasonable man of the efficacy of the Botanic Medicine; for I had offered liberal sums of money to several members of the faculty to cure my slave; but they said he could not be cured. He is now twenty-three years of age. October 26, 1835.

JAMES M'GAUGHEY."



*“Georgia, Walton County.—*This is to certify that, in the spring of 1831, I received a wound in my leg, which I did not get cured until fodder-pulling time. I re-hurt it, and it inflamed greatly, and appeared to threaten my life; on account of which my father called in Dr. Johnston, of Monroe, Walton County, who attended me seven days and nights; but still my leg appeared to be in a mortifying state. On this account my father called in two Botanic Physicians, to wit. William Coleman and M’Ray of Walton county. Accordingly they commenced a course of *Thomsonian treatment*, in which they used *lobelia* and *steam*, and raised me in a few days; for which I was thankful. October 26, 1835.

ANDREW J. M’GAUGHEY.”

*“Georgia, Clark County.—*This is to certify to all whom it may concern, that my son, Nathan Cook, was taken with the bilious fever on the 1st of November, 1833; and, on account of the violence of the disease, I sent for Dr. William Williamson, a mineral practitioner. He accordingly commenced a course of mineral practice on the said Nathan, and continued it for about 2 or 3 weeks; in the course of which time the said Dr. Williamson said the disease was typhus fever. He took me out, and told me that my son could not live, and that we might prepare for the loss of him; but he left some medicine to be given him. I determined, however, not to give it to him, as he had given him out. Therefore, Dr. Thos. J. M’Gaughey, a Botanic Physician, was called in to attend his case, and miserable it was. Dr. M’Gaughey immediately commenced with the Botanic Medicine, as directed by Howard and Thomson, to wit.

*Cayenne pepper, composition powder, No. 6, lobelia inflata and steam; and, in thirty minutes, there was an improvement beyond my expectation, and which was followed by a speedy recovery to good health. October 24, 1835.*

Z. COOK, Senior."

"I do certify that the above certificate is correct according to the best of my recollection in my infirm state of body and mind at that time; and also think it right to add that others of my family suffered by the same epidemic, and were cured in a short time by the Botanic Medicine administered by Dr. Thomas J. M'Gaughey.

NATHAN COOK."

I will, gentlemen, be candid, and give you the truth without reservation. The Medical Faculty in Georgia consists in strictness of three sections. The first may be called the southern cross of medicine; because they are dreaming theorists, unfit for action in our climate, and are seen as doctors only in the high southern latitudes of Greek and Latin. The second consists of men who, setting theories at defiance, depend on observation as a guide, and though successful in practice and in high repute with the public, are in strictness downright *empirics*—I shall term them the Ursa Major of Medicine. The third section, the largest of all, is composed of persons who, without much learning or mind, have studied Bell, Richcrand and Thomas from one year to two years off and on, and finally passed an examination by memorizing some medical catechism. They very justly dispense with surgery, because few cases occur in our state; and with obstetrics, because old women

are the most successful accouchers; and with chemistry, because not one physician in ten thousand ever thinks of testing his mineral salts either by analysis or synthesis before administering them to his patients—and with Botany, because acquaintance with class, order and genus, can enable no man to distinguish the pulverized bark of cinchona from powdered strychnos; and every body knows that the faculty rely on the good faith of the importer and apothecary for the purity of their vegetable agents. In fact, gentlemen, the third section, guided by “scientific principles,” are careful to simplify the practice, and confine themselves to a few remedies. The lancet, opium, antimony, Dover’s powders, ipecac, jalap, nitrate of silver, blue stone, arsenic, corrosive sublimate, cream of tartar, purple fox-glove, spurred rye and calomel they find equal to the fulfilment of every intention; and, as calomel is never omitted, they may be called *Ursa Minor*, revolving round, and being attached by the tail to the polar star of medicine, the subinuriate of quicksilver. Though large as to number, their practice is not extensive, except in seasons of epidemic, when they are sent for by such as the *empirics* cannot attend, just as the jackalls are represented picking bones after the lion is gorged. They are in bad odour with the first and second sections—the first denominating them, for not being acquainted with the dead languages and the sciences, the *opprobria* of the profession, and the second denouncing them as charlatans alike ignorant of nosology, ætiology, symptomatology, semeiotics, and therapeia. Indeed, the first section, having no practice to lose, hold them in more contempt than they do the steam-quacks; and the *empirics* frequently express

the hope of seeing them supplanted by the steamers, pretending that the event would not abridge their own practice, but relieve the profession from the charge of ignorance and destruction now often brought against it. To you this will be apparent when informed that, while the steam-quacks were, with their pepper and lobelia, forcing my dear son Dr. Ned of Talbotton, to disgorge his fibs, not one of them came to his rescue, but would utter a horse-laugh, and remark that his vanity, arrogance and disregard of truth merited castigation.

I have told you, gentlemen, that I will be candid; and I am determined to keep my word, knowing, as I do, that any falsification of the record would be detected by not a few of your honorable body, and subject me to the cow-whips of Curtis, Warden, and Equity. Well then, my son, Dr. Ned, and I belong to the third section of the Faculty, that honorable and consistent and numerous portion whom I have designated as the *Ursa Minor* of Medicine, on account of their hanging by the tail to the polar star of medicine, calomel, and in many diseases depending on it *per se*. Since, therefore, the pedantic dreamers have no practice to lose by the steamers being tolerated, and empirics anticipate no evil to themselves from such an event, and my son, Dr. Ned, is, though his organs of coloring and language are excessively developed, inadequate to appear before you as a logician, on account of the smallness of the bumps of individuality, comparison and causality, in his cranium, I must tell you plainly that, if you remove the penalty against steaming, I, son Ned, and the whole of our constellation must beg, dig or do worse, and that the abrogation of such penal sanctions would in strictness be a gross violation of

our State Constitution, which must, at all hazards, be preserved unimpaired. Let me illustrate.

By the Medical law of 1825, perfected by amendment in 1833, the management and cure of disease in our State were exclusively confined to and invested in the medical faculty, and consequently became their private property as fully and perfectly as a deed conveys the propriety of land to the purchaser. But the Constitution declares that the Legislature shall pass no law invading the right of private property. Therefore you cannot, by licensing steam-quackery, invade our rights; because such power has been denied to you; and the exercise of it would be usurpation, and justify revolution by recourse to arms.

Should it be objected that the exclusion of competition and innovation from any profession must arrest its improvement, and necessarily keep it stationary, if not allow it to retrograde; I rejoin that we, *urss* minorities, have already reached the utmost limits of useful discovery, revolving round, and bearing on our tail, the polar star of medical perfection, *argentum vivum*.

To the consideration that security of life is the prime motive of human congregation, especially in those of a republican character, and that, as the physieal part of man is powerfully influenced by the mental, individuals of opinion that mineral and vegetable poisons act in all cases deleteriously on the tissues, are apt to sink under the treatment of the most skilful regular practitioner; it is sufficient to remark that they have no right to indulge in idle whims to our prejudice, and if they be resolved to cherish such fantasies, it is better they should perish than we be deprived of our personal property given to us by their representatives and

guarantied by our constitution; that it is better they should moulder in the dust and their children become homeless, naked and starving orphans, than we lose the right to their pockets, and be compelled to labor or beg or do worse.

If you urge that persons harboring such sentiments would not take our medicine nor receive our attendance, and consequently would die, unless restored by the reaction of their constitution; I reply that, as you have given us property in every man, woman and child, while sick, it is your duty, by your oath, to maintain the constitution, by passing a law securing to us our fees in all cases of sickness, whether our services be requested or not; for, by the medical law of 1825, perfected in 1833, the people of Georgia explicitly and solemnly parted with the right of judging for themselves in such cases, and made the guardianship of their lives our private property, with the condition implied and well understood that it was to afford us revenue. Consequently we have a perfect right to attend every case of sickness, and it is imperiously incumbent on you to see that the laws be constructed so that we can secure our rights against all infringement either by malfaisance or evasion.

If humanity be pleaded—I obtend that it is more humane that clodhoppers should become the victims of their own stubborn ignorance, and their children outcasts and beggars, than we be stripped of the means of living an easy and a luxurious and a fashionable life, with which you have invested us by law, and which is secured to us by the constitution. I can conceive nothing connected with humanity that ought to influence us to voluntarily relinquish our ease and happiness and extravagance,

to merely gratify the caprice or even to advance the happiness of ignorant and vulgar people who labor with their own hands for the bread they eat. No, no, gentlemen; your casuistry is out of place. It is, to speak candidly, the duty of the mechanics, and the bumpkin farmers, and of you too, to swallow whatever we, in our judgment, may prescribe, and whether life or death follow, our bill ought to be paid promptly without reluctance or grumbling, though enough should not remain in their or your pockets to buy potatoes or corn-dodgers for the children. Such is the spirit of our medical law, which is based upon the Constitution, and which you have sworn to maintain inviolable.

Should you suggest that, if steam-quackery be a pernicious fallacy, tolerating it by law would be the speediest and surest method of destroying it, and of elevating the faculty; I must be permitted to remark, that you have no right to jeopard our private property and expose us to indigence and degrading manual labor, for the sake of enabling the public to test the relative utility of the steam practice and poisonous system. We are not to be seduced by such sophistry to our own destruction, self-preservation being the first law of nature.—Not a few of you know that our assent to such a proposition would be *felo de se*. We are apprized that the regular practice has gotten the galloping consumption in De Kalb, and that in Walton and Henry it is in the throes of death. If steam quackery, with penal sanctions hanging over it, be so potent in those counties, to legalize it by law, would be bringing the faculty throughout Georgia, with the exception of perhaps the *empirical* part, to the forlorn condition in which, it would be useless to deny, they now are in many parts of Tennessee,

Alabama and Ohio, hucksters, pedlers and country schoolmasters. We fancy no such experiments, but the retention of our rights, nolens volens, our private property, the supervision of your lives and familiarity with your pockets.

If you take the ground that, in relation to the exclusive privileges conferred upon us by the law of 1825, we are but tenants at will, and that your constituents, through you, have a right to open the trade, as the English Parliament have recently done in the intercourse with the Anglo-Indian dependencies, it will suffice to respond, that our monopoly was given without condition or limit of time; and therefore was equivalent in nature and amounted in fact to a *fee simple title*. Consequently, it is *our* private property, and to your lives and pockets our right is as undoubted as yours is to your homesteads, horses and cattle. If you cancel the one, we will cancel the other—because it would, on your part, be an abrogation of the social compact, by usurpation, robbery and perjury. Try it, if you dare.

Disdaining petty fibbing and low misrepresentation, I have been explicit and candid with you on this mementous subject; and I admonish you to recollect that you have been sent to Milledgeville, not to destroy, but to conserve the rights of individuals; and that you are under no obligation, in a moral or political sense, and have no authority in equity or by the Constitution, to plunder and rob one part of the community to gratify the avidity or prejudice of the other; that you are bound by honor, honesty and oath to preserve the rights of all; that the steam-quacks and their ignorant dupes have no right to practise under the Constitution; that the faculty have without termination the ex-



clusive monopoly of the management of all diseases, and that every attempt to divest them of it, is virtually an attempt at land-piracy, and ought to be declared felony without benefit of clergy.

**MEDICUS SENIOR.**



## APPENDIX.

✶ The preceding article closes the main Discussions which we proposed to publish. On examining the review by the Baltimore Thomsonians, of Dr. Williams's Speech, (page 5,) we see so little of general interest, that has not been also answered by us, that we shall doubtless perform a greater service for the Marylanders, by quoting O. P. Q.'s review of late trials of Thomsonian Practitioners in Washington County, than we could by citing, in aid of our answer, any notes from their review of Dr. Williams.

In page 6th of this work, Dr. Williams says, "Do not these Thomsonians get paid for their medicine and their services?" Let the fact that Dr. Sterling, of Baltimore, was defeated in a late attempt to collect a considerable sum for hard-earned and well-merited services, (he cured the patient,) and for no inconsiderable quantity of medicines, answer this question.

Again he says: "I am sure they may sell as much medicine as they choose and obtain as much as they can sell."

Well, doctor, they of Washington County did obtain and sell medicine, and perform important services to the sick, who were not only thankful, but willing to pay for them; but, it seems that your declaration that "they MAY SELL," proves you either ignorant of the laws of your State, even respecting your own craft, and of course unworthy to be a legislator; or a downright deceiver, who would induce the "ignorant" Thomsonians to be-

lieve that "they *may* get pay for their practice," till they should render themselves liable; when, for want of a certificate, to state that they had been in the Baltimore College for several years, paying their fees, and trying, as Dr. Chapman, Professor of the Institutes of Medicine in the University of Pennsylvania, says, "to harmonize the contrarieties of medical doctrines, a task indeed as impracticable as to arrange the fleeting vapors around us, [put the fog and the clouds in order,] or to reconcile the fixed and repulsive antipathies of nature:" [that is, to make oil and water combine without the use of an alkali, or to make the north pole of a magnet, attract the south pole of the needle:] some of your craft, liberal souls, called them before the court, according to the letter and the *medical intent*, but against the popular understanding and just spirit of the law, to suffer persecution and pay a fine of twenty-five dollars for the support of the craft, and their scientific antipathetic contrarieties; and as much more to the miscreant who is mean enough to complain that a good deed has been done.

The following excellent article bears abundant evidence of having been dictated by a mind of superior order. The author is not only a correct observer and judicious collator of facts, but a close and sound reasoner, well skilled in the great principles of common law and equity. The positions he lays down, are true, and the arguments he adduces in proof, are irrefutable. We express this opinion the more freely, as we know not who he is, and because we would bespeak for his article an attentive perusal, from friends and foes of Thomsonism. The Editor of the Mail too, not only deserves our thanks, for this proof of his liberality;

but, by scattering this article far and wide, regardless of the displeasure of the privileged order, has laid the whole community under lasting obligations to him. Let the political press continue to give a hearing to this System, and soon its enemies though diligently sought, will seldom be found.

*From the Hagerstown (Md.) Mail, May 27.*

#### A BRIEF REVIEW OF THE THOMSONIAN TRIALS AT OUR LATE COUNTY COURT.

The Practice of the Thomsonian System of Medicine, appears to be very much in the ascendancy, since the trials and punishment of Grosh, Jacobs and Tchudy. Like the rebel flower, it flourishes most when the pressure against it is severest.—But a question of some consequence arises: Is the “system” one which derives its importance only from persecution, to last so long as, and no longer than that persecution itself may last, or has it really truth and merit to recommend it? The writer of this attended with some interest to the trials of the first named persons, at our last county court, and has satisfied himself, as far as these trials are concerned, of the justness of three conclusions: 1st. That there is great merit in this new “system;” 2d. That the Thomsonian practitioners have met with an illiberal and persecuting opposition; and 3d. That these trials, by exposing publicly, in a Court of Justice, under the sanction of an oath, the manner of treatment, and number of extraordinary cures effected by Thomsonian Doctors, have evidently redounded to the great advantage of the “system,” and no small benefit

of the suffering community. Though under the indictments in these cases, the merits or demerits of the Thomsonian Practice were not strictly proper matters of legal testimony; for the true point was, whether its practitioners were entitled, by patent or law of Maryland, to practise at all without a license or diploma from the Medical College; yet, by consent of counsel on both sides, witnesses were called to testify to the practical effects of this "system." The first witness called, on the part of the State, was a regular doctor of standing and respectability in his profession, who stated that he believed that a certain Mr. B., of Williamsport, fell a victim to the Thomsonian System. Yet the doctor, upon being asked if he knew any thing of the "system," candidly acknowledged that all he knew of it was from hearsay. Now here was a great foundation for so serious a charge, mere "hearsay." And from the same veritable source, several other physicians who were examined on the part of the State, say they obtained their information, and thereupon decidedly denounced the system, though none other than the first named M. D. knew of any "victims." It is certainly not worth the while, to stop and enquire the value of an opinion based upon so flimsy a foundation. When men acknowledge that they are totally unacquainted with the principles of any science or art, their opinions in relation to that particular science or art, pass for nothing, and that deservedly too, for the simple reason, the want of a proper and reasonable foundation for their opinions. The opinions therefore of the regular doctors, expressed in this trial, as to the merit of the "system," are entitled to no influence whatever. Besides the whole testimony of the State, on this

point, viz: the merit of the Thomsonian System of Practice, was derived from the certificated and diplomatised practitioners of the healing art, who, as far as interest is concerned, may be said, without the least disparagement to a liberal profession, to have given the evidence under a very considerable bias. This certainly might have been the case, though, at the time, those gentlemen were entirely unconscious of its influence. Therefore, these two facts plainly destroy the weight of their testimony. Let us now take a hasty view of the testimony on the part of the traversers, in relation to the same point. This testimony was given by many gentlemen of the highest respectability, persons who had tried the system, and experienced the effects of it, in diseases of different natures, both of short and long standing; and they all, to a man, testified to the great merit of the "system." The evidence of Mr. S. of Baltimore, was full, clear and positive upon the point. In the course of his practice, he had met with, and cured, the most of the diseases common to the city. The writer recollects distinctly an astonishing case of the gout, which had been of about ten years standing, and at the time he undertook it, was pronounced incurable by other physicians. This case he cured by treating it after the Thomsonian System; and, if required, could produce a certificate to that effect. But as it regards Mr. S., it may be urged against his testimony, that he too also gave in his testimony under the strong bias of interest, as he is the agent of Thomson. Allow something for that, yet still he was in the possession of many facts connected with its practice, and professed, as he clearly proved himself, to be acquainted with the "system" in its theory. While under ex-

amination, the very learned and legitimate heir of Æsculapius, who assisted in the prosecution, did attempt, and probably succeeded, to perplex Mr. S. by asking him questions relating to the theory and practice of medicine as it is taught in the Medical College. But he should have known that such questions were as foreign to the point under examination, as he himself was, at that time, from his appropriate sphere of action; because, in the first place, Mr. S. utterly disclaimed any knowledge of those great *arcana*, known only to those who have access to sybiline books; and, in the second place, that Mr. S., as a Thomsonian, was not required by his system, to know any thing about it. There is no connexion between the two systems; they are antipodes to each other; they are founded on different principles; the practice under each is different, and their results, in many instances, are opposed to each other as much as sickness is to health, and life to death. Take another witness; Mr. Jacob Adams stated that he had been afflicted a long while with the rheumatic pains, could get no relief, was induced to apply to a Thomsonian, went through one course of the system, and in one half day, was rid of them. Mr. Emmert also proved that he had got essential relief in a case of a similar nature, by one course. Mr. Rowland proved that he had been troubled with pains in his back for *seven years*—had applied to regular doctors repeatedly, but found no benefit from their prescriptions—took one course of the new system, and pronounced himself entirely relieved. Mr. Curry stated that he had been unwell for years from a general debility, and what was thought to be an affection of the liver—was in the constant habit of taking medicine, but without per-



manent relief—went through three courses of Thomson's system, and now asserted that he felt better than he did *for fifteen years before*. Mr. Johnston testified to the happy effects of the "system" upon himself in an obstinate case of dyspepsia. Mr. Steinmetz proved its good effects in a case of polypus. Mr. Ringer said that a case of abortion was cured by this "system," in his own family. Mr. Witmer proved that the Thomsonian medicine was an effectual remedy for the sick headache. Mr. Keaner stated that he had been cured of a lingering bilious fever by the same means. Other gentlemen testified favorably to the same point; and many more, standing by, in the court hall, were present, ready and willing to be called to the stand as witnesses in its favor, had not the Court thought that already sufficient evidence of the merits of the system had been adduced. The first conclusion is therefore most apparent, that, as far as these trials show any thing, they have, by bringing before the community the facts above stated, under oath, most clearly demonstrated the very great merit of the Thomsonian System.

They also show that its practitioners have met with an illiberal and unjust opposition. The mere idea of a criminal prosecution always involves another idea, viz: the violation of some law to the detriment of community and consequent injury to society. In no just government can a law prohibiting a good action have existence. And if, through inadvertence, in framing a law, words should be used which might embrace particular cases not contemplated by the Legislature, those cases are not to be considered as the objects of that law, though coming within the letter, yet

not within the spirit of the law. As in the case often cited by legal writers, of a law passed in an ancient State, inflicting a severe penalty upon those persons who should draw blood from a citizen in the public street. A man was struck by apoplexy; a doctor, passing by, immediately bled him upon the spot. The Doctor of course was not held amenable under the law, for he did a good action; yet no case could possibly come more within the words and very letter of the law. The spirit of the law controlled its construction. Now, the evidence in these trials shows, beyond all question, that the Thomsonian practitioners have done great service to particular members of society. Their patients and their patients' friends were not there to complain. On the contrary, the witnesses all declared that they were perfectly satisfied with them, and still were in favor of the "system."—None of them who suffered either in health or pocket by the treatment of Grosh & Co., were the informers against them. The informers themselves, though entitled to twenty-five dollars, half the penalty in each case, have not come forward to claim the reward. In truth they are not known in the cases, but *who* they are, any person, though the most cautious, may venture to "guess." One thing at least may be said of them; that they are persons who are either so far removed from a sordid love of lucre, as to disdain to apply for the petty pittance of twenty-five dollars, or else are most heartily ashamed of the inglorious part they have taken in these prosecutions. The latter alternative is most probably the case. It is then most evident that these prosecutions were not got up to prevent mal-practice, or improper practice, by which the lives of the people were in jeopardy—

the only true and proper cause of such a prosecution. What then? Let us examine. Nearly forty years ago, a law was passed by the Legislature, giving to certain persons therein named, and to their successors who came within its provisions, the exclusive privilege of practising the "healing art" in Maryland; and excluding all others from the exercise of that privilege who were not licensed by the Faculty. At the trial, a distinction was taken between the practice of medicine as contemplated by that act of assembly, and the Thomsonian Practice as a "new system," and consequently not embraced in its provisions. We understood the Court to overrule this distinction. However, it was nevertheless pressed upon the jury, as they were the judges of the law as well as of the facts in these prosecutions. If we look at the preamble of the act of 1798, chap. 105, we find the moving cause of its passage to be "for the promoting medical and chirurgical knowledge throughout the State," and "to prevent the citizens thereof from risking their lives, in the hands of ignorant practitioners, and pretenders to the healing art." Now, according to evidence adduced upon their trials, are these Thomsonians "ignorant practitioners and pretenders to the healing art?"—No. If the witnesses spoke the truth, and who can doubt it, knowing them to be as respectable as any in this county, so far from being "ignorant" in the healing art, they are indeed most skilful—that many lives, instead of being jeopardized, have actually been rescued from jeopardy, by their practice. There can be no doubt then, that the law of '98 never intended to meet their case. But the different supplements, it is said, do. These supplements indeed speak another language.—

Not, as in the original act, the public good, but the emolument of the profession is the grand object. There is no mention of the very trifling words "knowledge" and "skill;" oh no, "*License*" and "*Diploma*," and the "*Medical Faculty*," are the golden terms. These are the important considerations of them. The only proper qualification of a practitioner is the possession of a Diploma or license; not, as formerly, skill and knowledge. How does this happen? Because a practitioner, to obtain a diploma, must first go through a regular course of studies at the Medical College, by which large sums of money are annually thrown into its coffers. "There's the rub." The faculty well know that a man might become a good and skilful doctor, without their aid extraordinary; that he might, self-taught, draw upon his own internal resources, assisted by lights, shed upon the subject from the volumes of ages; that he might, untrammelled by their regulations, consult the great book of nature, and extract wholesome medicine from the poisonous herb; [that is, doubtless, separate wholesome medicines from herbs among which are some that are poisonous;] the faculty knew all this, and they knew also that they would not be the better of it by one farthing.—Hence, the passage of these supplements. But, if a proper construction is put upon them, in connexion with the act to which they are supplements, it does appear that Grosh & Co., were not proper subjects for a criminal prosecution. All supplementary laws are parts of the original, confining, adding to, or enlarging the provisions of the original; so that, taken together, they, with the original law, are to be considered as but *one law*. And if in any supplement there should be found a

provision contrary to, or conflicting with, the spirit of the law or the general intention of the Legislature, that provision is to be rejected, in the construction. The question then results, what is the intention of the Legislature in passing these laws? This is easily answered by referring to the preamble of the act of '98, chap. 105. And this preamble, according to our construction, equally attaches itself to all the supplements. It is there stated that the object of the Legislature, in granting an act of incorporation to the Faculty of Maryland, have in view "the promoting medical and chirurgical knowledge throughout the State, and preventing the citizens thereof from risking their lives in the hands of ignorant practitioners or pretenders to the 'healing art.' " This is the true test, to try not only the original law, but also all its supplements; they being but one act of the Legislature, in the eye of a proper and legal construction. And this is the great use of a preamble to a law. It is said to be the key by which a law is unlocked, and its true meaning made manifest. The supplements, here considered, are the acts of 1801, chap. 55; 1821, chap. 217; which, though they embrace the cases of Grosh & Co., in *their letter*, do not, any more than the act of '98, chap. 55, embrace them, in *their spirit*. We thus come to our second conclusion, that these Thomsonian practitioners have met, in Washington County, with an unjust and illiberal opposition; that they have, instead of being prosecuted, been actually persecuted; for they were indicted for doing *good*, not *evil*; convicted by the letter of the law, and plainly acquitted by its spirit. The writer may be permitted to disclaim all intention of reflecting on the Court or Jury who tried these cases. The

Jury, to whom the cases with the law and the facts were committed, doubtless acted conscientiously. But, owing to the great length and tediousness of the trials, the great excitement of the crowd, and the rather dry and uninteresting discussion of the proper construction of the law, they could not have given that attention to the subject which its importance demanded.

Since the trials, many who were before opposed to the system, are become its friends. They have been induced to try it solely in consequence of such a current of unimpeachable testimony in its favor. They also approve of it. Public sentiment is in its favor. Surely this fact proves our third conclusion; and much more need not be said. It is not our intention to claim any thing in advance for this "new system," but only to bespeak for it and its practitioners a fair and candid trial. If, upon the unerring test of time and experience, it comes out good, it will be pronounced the very first of the improvements of this improving age; if bad, it will sink, in a short time, of its specific gravity, and be looked upon only as the well-intended and benevolent speculation of a philanthropic mind; and the name of Thomson will be associated with that of John Howard, in all after generations, when they speak of the benefactors of mankind.

There is another question suggested by those trials; Ought not the Legislature of Maryland, in order to put this matter to rest, and do away all doubt upon the subject, to repeal the law incorporating the Medical College and its supplements altogether, or enact another, giving the Thomsonian Practitioners, duly authorized by Thomson himself or his Agents, to practise, with the same

privileges as the doctors according to law? The examination of this question does not properly come within the scope of our present subject. We may at some future time take it up; for we believe it is worthy of public attention. And, if we do so, we shall endeavor to establish the affirmative of it.

O. P. Q.

---

## NOTES,

*On Dr. Williams's Speech, page 5.—See our Note, last paragraph, page 37.*

Dr. Williams says, page 6, the medical law “was not intended for the benefit of any privileged order of men, but to protect society and advance the science of medicine.”

In the prosecutions just reported, it is shown,

1st. That half the money goes to the Medical College, and half to the learned doctor or his tool who complains.

2. That the law secures all the honor and profit to the “privileged order of men,” self-styled “regular physicians,” of whom Dr. Williams is one.

But Dr. Williams says, it was “to protect society.” We ask from what? On page 15, he says, from “Quackery.” Good, say we; but what is quackery? All will agree that it is pretence to know and do what one neither knows nor can do, and a concealment of medical principles and the nature of remedial agents from the knowledge of the patient. Now, who were guilty in the cases cited in evidence in the court of Washington

County, Maryland, the Thomsonians or the Regulars? Let us see. The regulars professed to be able to cure the patients. They kept the principles on which, and the nature of the remedies with which they operated, a profound secret,—They held out the idea that their science was too profound for the comprehension of their patients, and they wrote their prescriptions for remedies in an unknown tongue. Had they told their patients, in plain English, we are going to draw your life blood, which will be sure to weaken you, and give you calomel which will most probably rot your teeth and deaden your limbs, and very likely produce dropsy not long hence, we shall give you more opium than is frequently found to produce death; we shall blister you with flies whose acrid salts are frequently so absorbed as to increase the disease and produce distressing strangury, without certainly knowing that all these evils may not befall you in consequence of our scientifically-prescribed guess-work; those patients would have exclaimed, with astonishment, Doctor, I sent for you to cure me; and, it seems, you intend to take the most effectual plans and means to kill me! begone! I would rather die of disease than be thus tortured to death! Yet such is the solemn truth, and we are prepared to prove it. By their “scientific” pretensions, their Greek and Latin names of disease, and their abbreviated prescriptions, they deceive the people, and this is what makes Thomsonians so severe upon them when they discover their “scientific” quackery!

But Dr. Williams says, also, the “provision was made to advance the science of medicine.”

Let us prove this. Dr. Hays, Dr. Gregory and others say, “the object of medicine is to prevent



and cure disease;" of course the science of medicine must be the knowledge of the nature of disease, and the art of preventing and curing it. Very well. When those "scientific conjecturers" of Maryland, had guessed and experimented a long time on their patients, and nearly ruined their constitutions, the Thomsonians went directly at them, honestly telling them, you are full of phlegm, cold and canker, and the poisonous drugs of the doctors; we will give you cayenne and bayberry, and steam and puke you till we get those poisonous and deadly drugs out of you; then we will give you bitters of poplar, such as grows in your yard (or you may get it yourself if you choose) and other such like things, with good nourishing food, and soon your debilitated frame will be strong, your canker-eaten flesh will be sound, and your now poisoned blood purified! They did it, and cured the patients whom scientific quackery had long treated in vain—nay worse than in vain! Thomsonism, quackery; and the regular practice, scientific! Oh shame, where is thy blush! It is evident, therefore, that the court ought to have turned round and indicted and punished the scientific quacks, and encouraged the Thomsonian "art of curing disease," by setting its practitioners free, according to the spirit of the law, as interpreted by Dr. Williams.

Dr. Williams asks, page 18th, if we are prepared to cast off the experience of ages, and usher forth ignorant pretenders who give no evidence of their skill in the healing art, but that they have bought a twenty dollar book, &c.?

We answer, by no means on this ground. We are prepared, by our personal knowledge of the destructive effects of the "scientific" practice,

the comparison of the fate of the sick where it is and where it is not administered, to pronounce it not only "entirely worthless," but fearfully destructive to human life and happiness; and to call upon the Thomsonians to cure us of disease on the strength of the well known fact that they cure all the patients whose constitutions are good, and a multitude whom the "scientific practice" had well nigh ruined. We, the people, can see these things, Doctor, without the aid of Latin or Greek; and you may rely upon it, we are too deeply interested in the matter not to make a wise election. The light that now beams over this land, in the success of the Thomsonian practice, will soon dissipate the popular reverence for your scientific mysticism and imposture, and woe to those whom the people shall believe to have knowingly and wilfully deceived them!

Science is a systematic arrangement of facts. The frequent failures of the "regular plan" [it almost chokes us—even the attempt to use this word "regular," in connexion with the class of men styled "the medical faculty,"] to cure a patient who has a fever, proves that their "scientific" notion that fever is a disease, is not a fact; of course nothing that they have written on this important subject, can be properly termed science. But, by uniformly curing every fever patient, the Thomsonian proves that the principle on which he operates, viz. that fever is an effect of a salutary effort of life, to rid the body of disease, is a fact. Of course what Dr. Thomson says of its nature, operations and intentions, and the mode and means of removing its cause, is true medical science, and that he and his followers ought at least to be protected;—to be "advanced" they do not

ask; only permit them to use steam and cayenne freely, and they can advance themselves far ahead of the regular faculty, with all their "wise" legal "provisions" to help them.

---

*The Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, and "The Principles it labors to sustain."*—See page 36.

Dr. Smith, the Editor, says in this note, which, on account of the miscarriage of the number of the Journal containing it, we did not receive till lately, that the subject of our answer to Dr. Williams is "at war with the principles he labors to sustain."

Let us examine the truth of this declaration.

In our answer, we taught the doctrine that disease is a unit, an obstruction to the equal and universal operations of the vital energies; that fever is the *vis medicatrix naturæ*, the repulsive action of nature, to throw off disease; that medicines are only the instruments nature makes use of, to strengthen her efforts against disease, and that all *our* efforts to aid her, should be in harmony with her operations. These truths, Dr. Smith says, "are at war with the principles he labors to sustain;" but, on page 289 of his 9th volume, he had quoted the same doctrines from Hufeland, and said of them, page 290, "though it is exceedingly doubtful whether this view can be maintained with regard to diseases generally, yet, of some, it certainly affords a convenient and plausible explanation." His chief fear of it seems to be, that they who believe it will not bleed, blister, physic, starve and

poison their patients quite so much as he would recommend. He says, "it is little calculated to lead to any very energetic practice," which he proves by quoting further from Hufeland, that "Nature," not the remedy, "performs the cure. If you *assist her* too much, or disturb her healthy operations with heroic means and violent methods, especially poisons and immoderate blood-letting, you hinder, by your *remedies*, the sanatory process, instead of furthering it." These doctrines we suppose are in harmony with "the principles the editor labors to sustain."

We taught the doctrine that poisons were calculated to injure the constitution, and of course ought never to be given to cure disease. This was opposed to Dr. Smith's principles, he could not admit it into his paper; but, on page 43 of his 9th volume, he had suffered one of his diplomatized correspondents to say that poisons "all agree in one point, the sudden and rapid extinction of a great proportion of the vitality of the system;" and, on page 44, that they should be removed by the exhibition of "some powerful, uniform and steady diffusible stimulant—an exciting and supporting course;" but he would not permit us to use, in the removal of poisons, what the Edinburgh Encyclopedia says is the strongest and purest stimulant known, and produces no narcotic or injurious effect, viz. CAYENNE PEPPER.

He would not permit us to teach the doctrine that "the science" of medicine had not improved by age, but he would suffer Dr. Bigelow to say that it had not advanced even in the last fifty years of this age of improvement; that measles, scarlet fever, and many other forms of disease would run their full course, in their full power, in spite of all

that doctors could do to prevent them, and he commended the doctor, though he intimated that the exertions of a physician were *totally* useless, except to prevent others from doing mischief. He would not let us say that the "science of medicine" was based on error and of no value; but, in his 14th volume, page 181 and onward, he could allow Dr. L. M. Whiting to call all the medical theories of past ages "incomprehensible mysticisms and absurd speculations;" and nosologies, "confusion worse confounded;" to say that "disease never has, till quite recently, been investigated;" that Hippocrates knew no more about the diseased condition of the body than many a diplomatized quack of the present day; that "as a pathologist, he was nothing;" and that "the same observations will apply equally well to a great share of his successors, even down to our own time." "With respect to the *study of disease*," he continues, "they have all gone out of the way." "The very principles on which their theories were based have never been established;" "they are false; and, consequently, the superstructures built thereon, are as the baseless fabric of a vision." Men "assume certain elements as the materials of the human body, which were never proved to exist." Because they do not exist."

Even "Cullen knew nothing or next to nothing about the organs in their physiological condition; much less did he know of their condition in a pathological state, [much less than nothing or next to nothing—*perhaps* this is scientific.] "From him then, we get no more light on the grand question What constitutes *disease*? than we do from old Hippocrates, Galen, Boerhaave, Brown, Darwin, and all indeed who either preceded or followed him, until within the last half century, and

that amounts to *just nothing at all* that is satisfactory to the enquiring mind!" "Their efforts have proved a total failure!" Alas for Dr. Delony's 4,000 years of medical experience, and Dr. Smith's "perfect agreement with this *talented author!*" Dr. Whiting handles them both with gloves off, yet Dr. S. does not complain of Dr. W. for saying things "at war with the principles he labors to sustain," though calculated greatly to *depress* "the profession, and lessen the dignity of medical science!" Indeed, if one of our Thomsonian brethren, should be so severe as Dr. W. on "the profession," or guilty of such an abuse of language and science as to talk about "much less than nothing at all;" We, as Editor, should feel it our duty to score him a little for it; instead of feeding his vanity with the complimentary appellation of "*original thinker,*" possessed of "*power to acquire distinction in the pursuit of science,*" and by thorough investigation, to diffuse light in regions of darkness." [Of 4,000 years of experience we suppose.] But after all, what has the gentleman done? Why really he has discovered by "investigation" what hundreds and thousands have told him in so many words, that the famous 4,000 years of medical experience, though some part of it may be good, is, all taken together, far more pernicious than useful. It is striking at random or in the dark, says D'Alembert. It is the highest degree of uncertainty, says Abercrombie. It is learned quackery, says Waterhouse. It is so impossible to separate from it the useful from the trivial, says Lieutaud, that it were better to reject it all. It has thrown no new light on the form of disease (fever) that the physician must always be prepared to meet, says Gregory. It has not ad-

vanced the knowledge of the art of preventing and curing disease, say Thacher and Bigelow. It were a task as impracticable to reconcile the contrarieties of medical doctrines, as to arrange the fleeting vapors around us, or to reconcile the fixed and repulsive antipathies of nature, says Chapman, far "within the last half century" too, mind ye, Dr. Whiting. But where shall we stop?

After all this condemnation even to "anathema maranatha, [very severe we think, but perhaps the Doctor did not know the meaning of the words,] we might expect that *his* theory would be something more substantial than "the baseless fabric of a vision;" but alas! he reminds us of the remark of poor *Darwin*, whom he has so severely handled, viz. "I beg what I have done to be considered as a foundation and scaffolding which may enable future industry to erect a solid and beautiful edifice, eminent for its simplicity and utility:—*which may not moulder like the structures already erected*, into the sand of which they were composed; but which may stand unimpaired, *like the Newtonian philosophy*, a rock amidst the waste of ages." "Oh blindness to the future, kindly given," &c.

What think you reader, is Dr. Whiting's plan for finding out the nature and character of disease and establishing just principles of therapeutics? He says "the pestiferous mists" of medical error, are "to be dispersed," the errors of ignorance exposed, and the clouds of hypothesis swept from the horizon of medical science, by—listen attentively, it is coming—by that all-potent wand, the scalpel of the pathologist!"—the knife with which a learned doctor cuts up dead bodies, to see how disease operated in them when they were alive. He appears to suppose that the disclosures to be made by this

wonderful instrument, " will form the basis of a theory of disease which shall stand, a tower of strength, unharmed by the rude shock of opposition's bursting wave, through all succeeding time." What will he do with the declaration of Morgagni, that " they who have inspected the greatest number of bodies, are the most inclined to doubt the accuracy of their knowledge of the characters of disease!"

The Doctor dares not deny that the variations in the structures of the different portions of different human bodies, even in a healthy state, are so numerous and great, that the most accurate descriptions of the most perfect forms, have never been a guide sufficient to enable more than one person in a hundred to ascertain, by inspection of another body, without a living teacher, the parts and portions indicated by the descriptions. How much greater must be the disparity, where the lawlessly directed energies of chemical decomposition, have been committing depredations on that body, Morgagni has correctly stated.

But Dr. Whiting does not suppose that, even by this new method, we are coming with certainty at the *concealed* or *essential* cause of disease; or that it will ever afford even a glimpse of its nature or composition. "These may forever remain involved in the deepest obscurity." "He knows not that any benefit would be derived from such knowledge. If the obvious causes be detected and removed, it is enough; the concealed causes may take care of themselves; they are of no consequence to us." ["The secret causes of disease of no consequence to a physician," indeed, when it is solely for want of the knowledge of these causes, that the faculty have never learned how to cure



disease!] So it seems that after all, the doctor intends to follow the beaten track of error, which he but just now severely abused ; that of working on the effects of disease, instead of its causes. We imagine that while he "assumes" this ancient and universal medical error, as the basis of his theories, he will not be more successful than "smarter men than he" have been in "raising a temple which shall be as impregnable to the attacks of visionary schemers, as the rock of Gibraltar to the surge which harmlessly lashes its adamantine pillars;—that is, in discovering and setting forth the laws which will continue to govern diseased action as long as organization remains organization."

It would be really amusing if it were less painful, to follow up the doctor's singular notions about the ground-work of his new pathology, or theory of disease. Suffice it to say that it is to be built upon the proportion of certain symptoms known to have been observed in other cases only as the results of circumstances in which the patients were placed—a system of "medical guess-work" that has scarcely its parallel in the whole bundle of theories he affects so cordially to despise.

Dr. Abercrombie says, so great is the difference in the appearances of diseases supposed to resemble each other, arising out of the operation of a train of causes that so completely elude our observation, that we can scarcely be said, in the treatment of *any* case of disease, to act from experience. Indeed the difficulties and sources of uncertainty are so numerous and great, that our pretended experience must generally sink into analogy, and our analogy too often into conjecture.

But Dr. Whiting is about to make, of what most led Morgagni to doubt, a foundation on which to build an imperishable temple of medical science!

But to return to Dr. Smith. He would not allow us to pronounce medical experience of little value, but he commends Dr. Whiting as a man of talents, original thinking, and power to discover and diffuse light, [among doctors,] for saying, "System after system has arisen, flourished, fallen and been forgotten, in rapid and melancholy succession, until the whole field is strewed with the disjointed materials—a perfect chaos; and, amongst the rubbish the philosophic mind may search for ages without being able to glean from it hardly *one solitary well established fact.*"

Though Dr. Smith would not allow us to "lessen the dignity of medical science," by proving that the regular therapeutics or art of applying remedies to disease, was, on the whole, more dangerous than useful; he allows Dr. Whiting to say "that it is a perfect chaos;" that the "day dreamers" of past ages "have entirely mistaken the mode of coming at what they wished to remove by those [their remedial] agents." Dr. S. would not allow us to say that the true causes of disease might be known, and the effectual remedy be directed with physical certainty; but Dr. Whiting may say, "the laws which govern disease or morbid action [he does not know what it is] are invariable in their operation, and the relation of certain agents to those morbid conditions of the organization are always the same, and may be made out with certainty; forming a theory of therapeutics as immutable as any other natural law. [This is a scientific flourish, which means a great deal more than our few unpretending words.] Dr. S.

would not allow us to "lessen the dignity of medical science" by calling it guess-work;" but Dr. Whiting may say, of the whole business, [Journal, 190 vol. xiv,] "Were we to see a sportsman standing beside a grove continually loading and discharging his piece without aim among the trees, and at the same time declaring his intention to destroy a bird whose song he heard somewhere within it, we should without hesitation pronounce him not only *non compos*, but also a dangerous individual and fit only for the strait jacket or the mad house. Yet such, if we mistake not, is the course pursued by many a routine practitioner in the treatment of morbid conditions of the human body. "Shoot away! is the motto, perchance we may hit the mark; if not, the law is our safeguard," &c.; and he adds at least one truth, that "*the day is coming and now is*, when the names of men who, while the sun of science is shedding o'er the land its flood of living light, still prefer the darkness and persist in *quackery*, will be seathed with the lightnings of public indignation." Surely our answer to Dr. Williams contained nothing half so well calculated as this (if it were true) to depress "the profession, or to lessen the dignity of medical science."

We wish it to be understood that our object in quoting from this "original thinker," so much common place slang against the "science of medicine, (we could copy almost the same words from fifty printed books with which Dr. Whiting is or professes to be acquainted,) is to show that any thing and every thing may find access to the pages of the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, however much it "lessens the dignity of medical science," *provided it comes from a member of the*

*Massachusetts Medical Society.* We do not ourselves believe half the declarations he has made. Did we not believe that the "medical guess-work" they are calculated to check, had better, on the whole, be destroyed than sustained, we would review his article and prove him not only not "an original thinker," but a most loose and reckless declaimer against many well-grounded opinions and worthy personages—a slanderer and abuser of medicine and its advocates, whose equal cannot be found in all the Thomsonian ranks—no not even in him whom the faculty once bound in irons. Dr. Smith permits Dr. Whiting to declare that the faculty have not found one solitary truth respecting the theory of life, of health, of the causes of disease, or diseased conditions of the body, or of the means or modes of curing or removing them. Whereas, the fact is, they have, among them all, found out the truth on every one of these points; and the only reason why they *have* not a beautiful, simple, consistent, harmonious system of medicine, based upon "a foundation as firm as the rock of Gibraltar," is, all their correct theories are only incidental remarks so smothered amidst the more fascinating exhibitions of error, that no one doctor has ever been able to distinguish between truth and falsehood and separate the gold from the dross. For example, Dr. Smith allows Dr. Philip to talk about the excellence of minute doses of mercury, and Dr. Yandell to recommend 250 grains at a time, and (in vol. ix., page 85,) Dr. Henry George to say that in any quantity it is a most pernicious drug, and that, "at an early age, no circumstances would justify its use," because he had seen many a child killed—nay, had killed several himself, by its administration; while he

perfectly agrees with the talented Dr. Delony that it will cure more than one-half of the whole list of Botanic remedies all put together! Not seeming at last, to care whether Hahnemann gives the ten-millionth part of a grain, or Yandell gives 250 grains, or others half a pound, as some have done. He allows Doctors to recommend the tincture of cantharides in dropsy &c., and the substance in blisters for fever, pain, delirium, &c.; yet he permits Bagilvi, through his reporter, to abuse cantharides with an unsparing hand for their "mischievous, dangerous, gangrenous or mortifying effects," from the absorption and circulation of their sharp, poisonous salt; and to declare that it is absurd to suppose that blisters can draw out the venom of malignant fevers." He allows Hippocrates and others to say that fever is a sanative effort of the system to expel morbid causes, and Gregory and others to say that it is itself a disease more to be dreaded than all others put together; Sydenham to declare that nine-tenths of all the human race die of it, either as a primary or a secondary affection; Barton to say that the most active poisons are, in general good medicines, and Senex to assert that, however different in other respects, all poisons agree in the sudden and rapid extinction of a great proportion of the vitality of the system; Dr. Williams and Dr. Delony to declare that the science of medicine *in totality* is a splendid temple, a monument of the genius, industry and united wisdom of 4,000 years of philosophical investigation; Dr. Bigelow to assert that it fails to present, among its archives, the knowledge of the art of curing disease; and last but not least, he allows and "encourages" that "industrious, original and scientific thinker," Dr. L. M. Whiting, to

“exert his mental energics,” his “power to acquire distinction in the pursuits of science,” in the effort to diffuse “through the dark regions” of a college of doctors, the light of the glorious truth, that, “till within the last half century, the whole medical world had learned and taught *just nothing at all* that is satisfactory to the enquiring mind;” or, to keep up the figure, that Drs. Williams, Delony and Smith’s beautiful and well-proportioned temple and all its archives, its universal panacea, calomel, and all “are a perfect chaos” strewing the whole field with rubbish and disjointed materials, amongst which, the philosophic mind may search for ages without being able to glean from it hardly “*one solitary well established fact.*”

Let us now ask the question why Dr. Smith could not admit into his Journal, our answer to Dr. Williams, or how, if he had done it, he would have failed “to elevate the profession,” or have “lessened the dignity of medical science,” or how it could be “at war with the principles he labors to sustain.”

It appears then, that, “to elevate the profession” is to advocate every thing they do or say, however absurd and contradictory, and more especially to suppress every investigation of their conduct and principles, by any person who is not of their own number: That, as the principles they labor to sustain, are all the contradictory and absurd notions of all their “scientific order; and that the introduction “among this chaos of rubbish,” of even one clear, connected and consistent article, developing principles founded on facts and established by sound reason and conclusive argument, would lessen the dignity of both the guess-

ers and their medical guess-work," by showing, notwithstanding all their declarations to the contrary, that there is such a thing in the world as a simple, clear and truly scientific medical theory, on which is based a safe and certain practice "that will stand, as Dr. Whiting says, unharmed by the rude shock of opposition's bursting wave through all succeeding time."

---

## DISCUSSIONS IN NORTH CAROLINA.

In the first paragraph, page 78, it is stated that "Medicus probably wrote the piece signed 'Omar.'"

In page 90, we stated that we had never received Omar's last. In answer to a request for this piece, with the names of the several persons engaged in the Discussion, we lately received the following, dated Elizabeth City, N. C., April 6, 1836.

DEAR SIR: Dr. Bettner wrote over the signature of Medicus. Time was when he was almost worshipped by a certain class in town. His first piece was thought by his admirers unanswerable; and the cry of victory was every where raised by the enemies of pepper and steam; but, in an hour when they looked not for it, Botanist broke in upon them, and their joy was turned to mourning.—Dr. Bettner left town for Europe soon after you carried him through the last course. I don't know that he has been heard of since. [What has become of his pamphlets? See page 90.—EDITOR.] "Omar;" we are not absolutely certain who he was;

(but if we know him, he has very little to do.)—"Botanist:" almost every person knows who he was. I revealed it to the editor and a friend or two, enjoining secrecy of course; but so much the more it spread. The names of "Botanist" and Dr. Curtis are synonymous here; but, as the Discussions will have a wide circulation, perhaps it will be better to put your own name to your articles.

Our practice is doing every thing here. I have for the last three months been engaged in attending small pox, and with a success that has astonished friends and foes.

Your much obliged friend,  
WILLIAM ELLIOT.

I send you Omar's farewell, copied carefully from the Herald of the Times. W. E.

*Omar.* I have been reading with no small degree of amusement, the communication of "Botanist," in your paper of the 20th ultimo. In this, as in the rest of his abortive efforts—

*Editor.* Abortive efforts are those that were never made, truly scientific for a learned doctor!

*Omar.* Every thing is assumed and nothing proved—every thing taken for granted, and nothing confirmed. It is, in fine, "voces inanes, et preterea nihil."

*Editor.* Empty sounds, and after them nothing. This decision is "assumed, but not proved"

*Omar.* As to the "small fry volunteering their services in aid of Medicus," permit me to assure your very modest correspondent that Medicus needs assistance from no one, in defending the science of medicine against the puny efforts of



quackery; and that the assertion was not made with a good grace by him, after the severe drubbing given him by that gentleman.

*Editor.* All assumed, but not proved.

*Omar.* "Botanist" does not hesitate to say, that he believes the System of Thomson will do more good than all the improvements made by those illustrious philosophers, Buffon, Locke, Lavoisier, Priestly, Black and Davy! This declaration speaks volumes for the "profound learning and discriminating judgment of "Botanist."

*Editor.* Yes, because, as we proved that Thomson devised the means of preserving health, without which, all other temporal blessings are vain.

*Omar.* The names of those great men will continue to be remembered with admiration and gratitude by every lover of science, when that of Thomson shall have been swallowed up in the vortex of oblivion.

*Editor.* Assumed, but not proved.

*Omar.* "Botanist," with a degree of arrogance and impudence, of which no parallel is can found except in the history of modern quackery, tells us that he and his brother Thomsonians "are enabled far to surpass" the greatest physicians that have spent years in studying and teaching medicine. Oh, modesty, how art thou fallen!

*Editor.* Omar should remember the rule "always to except present company," when he speaks of parallels. In proof that we can excel them, we inform Omar that we cured a patient on whom Doctor Physick of Philadelphia, and another on whom Professor Mott of N. York, had exhausted their skill in vain, though they "have spent years in teaching medicine." We have done such things for many other eminent physicians, as our breth-

ren did in the case of Mr. Daniel, and many more.

*Omar.* "Botanist" would have us believe there is great absurdity in placing Paracelsus and Thomson side by side in another world, as kindred spirits.

*Editor.* So there is. Paracelsus contrived and introduced the poison chemico-mineral practice; Thomson explodes it, and substitutes the innocent Botanic practice. Paracelsus was a sot and a debauchee. Thomson is temperate and moral.

*Omar.* Let us see if there is not some similarity in their characters to justify such an association. Paracelsus decried all regularly educated physicians; so does Thomson.

*Editor.* So did Rush, Brown and Licutaud; and so does every one who denounces the "scientific practice."

*Omar.* Paracelsus rejected as frivolous, all the opinions of his predecessors, and declaimed vehemently against all the learned works written by the great masters of the healing art.

*Editor.* So did Brown and Rush, and so does Dr. L. M. Whiting, and Dr. Smith "encourages" him in this "industrious exercise of his original thinking." See our last article.

*Omar.* Paracelsus was a vain, arrogant fool, destitute of sound sense and solid acquirements; so is Thomson.

*Editor.* Assumed, but not proven. Still it is a pity the regulars don't carry out the comparison and elect Thomson professor of medicine in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore, as they did Paracelsus at Basle.

*Omar.* Paracelsus, it is true, died a beggar and a sot; but Thomson is not yet dead, and I cannot say he will not die a beggar, a sot, or even by the gallows.

*Editor.* It is not best to prophesy things future, after exhibiting so much ignorance or wilful misrepresentation of what have been and are.

*Omar.* The dialogue between the two kindred spirits, in another world, is a rare *morceau* of wit. It reminds me of Shakspeare's Knight in the Twelfth Night, or What you Will. "Botanist" can say with great truth, in the words of Sir Andrew,

"Methinks sometimes I have no more wit than a Christian or an ordinary man has."

*Editor.* What has this to do in proof that Paracelsus and Thomson are kindred spirits?

*Omar.* Paracelsus "has long enjoyed the happiness of seeing that his name has been handed down to posterity with great veneration." For what, I would ask this witty "Botanist," is the name of Paracelsus venerated? Is it for his arrogance pray? or for his vanity?

*Editor.* On these accounts chiefly (as you say he had no learning or science) he was made Professor of Medicine at Basle, "where he was honorably received and became eminent by the number, respectability and attachment of his pupils, and by the many extraordinary cures he performed by the prudent use of mercury and opium, &c.; whose powers, till then, were little known or unskilfully applied." But chiefly he has been venerated as the father of the poisonous mineral practice, which Omar and Medicus profess still to follow, as obedient children.

*Omar.* Or is his name venerated because he lived a vagabond and died a sot?

*Editor.* Vox inanis—a foolish question.

*Omar.* I shall now take leave of "Botanist," the indefatigable, but unfortunate *Knight of the bath.*

*Editor.* Assumed, but not proved.

*Omar.* It was not my intention or wish to draw him or any of his breed into a controversy.

*Editor.* Then you must be as stupid as a certain animal with long ears; for you did what was calculated to effect it.

*Omar.* This alone has given them notoriety and lengthened out the brief span of their ephemeral existence.

*Editor.* Assumed again.

*Omar.* In the language of Junius, the gentle breath of peace will leave them on the surface neglected and unremoved.

*Editor.* Was Junius a learned doctor, that you cite him as medical authority? Your declaration is only assumed.

*Omar.* It is only the tempest that lifts them from their place.

*Editor.* Assumed.

*Omar.* I wish your correspondent "Botanist" a long good night.

*Editor.* Good night, Omar.

*Omar.* May he awake from a profound sleep, relieved from the "pain in his head and his mental aberrations."

*Editor.* Thank you, Omar, same to you; and from pain in the heart too.

Signed,

OMAR.

*Remark.* What has all the above—nay any single sentence of it to do with proving that Thomsonism is quackery, or that there is, among diplommatized physicians, such a thing as "medical science?" We confess we can see nothing, nor are we able to see any thing more to the purpose in any of the other slang of the M. Ds. against the

steam practice. One thing seems very strange to us, which is, that, if Medicus and Omar were able to defend the science of medicine, and root up quackery, why they did not do it, instead of relinquishing the field and their practice to the steam doctors, as we are credibly informed by Dr. Elliott they have done.—*Editor or "Botanist."*

---

## A REVIEW

OF THE

### REPORT OF DR. J. H. MILLER,

*Attending physician at the Baltimore Almshouse, to the Trustees of that Institution; dated May 1, 1835.*

Dr. M. says: "In such establishments the mortality must always be great 'much greater than in private practice, because such are the resorts of worn out lives; they are *humanity's commons*, where the useless and incurable are 'turned out to die;' and they are also known as the *portals of oblivion* into which are thrown many of the 'victims of mal-practice.'"\* Though "such are

---

\*PORTALS OF OBLIVION.—The attending physician at the Baltimore Almshouse, for 1834—5, says, that institution is one of "the portals of oblivion into which are thrown many of the victims of mal-practice." Such are Thomsonian Infirmeries for all that are cured in them: but, if one in a hundred should die there, he is held up in everlasting remembrance, as an evidence of the murderous tendency of *Thompsonalgia*. Such are the prejudices against our system, created by the lies fabricated in the manufactories of "Demetrius and the craftsmen," that, to become first "useless or incurable," or "the victims of mal-practice," is the al-

the common and inevitable reasons why almshouse practice is shaded with darker results; yet there are, perhaps, some others which have been peculiar to the last year and to this place. Greater facilities than usual have been afforded to the transfer of hopeless cases from our own hospitals and infirmaries, of patients who have exhausted both their funds and the skill of their physicians, and in this forlorn predicament are sent here to obtain quiet graves."

On reading this paragraph, we could not repress our deep sympathy with the Doctor, nor forbear to assure him of that of the whole Thomsonian Fraternity, especially of those who live in cities and keep infirmaries. These Infirmaries are emphatically "humanity's commons, where the useless and incurable are turned out to die." And they are also well known as the "portals of oblivion into which are thrown many of the victims of mal-practice."

"Many other causes might be advanced," says the Doctor, "as tributary to the amount and se-

---

most indispensable requisite to constitute either a Thomsonian Practitioner or a faithful and persevering patient of this order. In fact, there is scarcely a Thomsonian in the United States, worthy of the name, who has not been made such, by this "fire-trying process," either in his own person or that of some near and dear relative or connexion. In proof of this statement, suffice it to refer the reader to the testimonies every where scattered over the pages of the Thomsonian Recorder. Take the 9th number for example. In these Infirmaries, however, "the mortality is [*less* instead of] greater than in private practice; because," here the patient is carefully watched and obliged to mind his prescriptions; whereas, "in private practice," he is not only careless and neglectful in these respects; but so generally beset between the doctor's visits, by the clamors about "burning, scalding and poisoning," [a most terrible thing in the eyes of doctors] aided by some Demetrius or craftsman, or more commonly woman, that more mischief is done by these *kind friends*, than good by the doctor's remedies.

verity of the diseases we have treated; but the most prolific source is the too prevalent vulgar practice of over stimulation, by the steam and scalding portions [potions] of a now popular empiricism."

We thought he was about to say, "by ardent spirits," when we should have heartily agreed with him; but no, the greatest curse this nation suffers, is not equal to that which follows the sin of teaching men to take care of their own health, and thus depriving the Doctors of that false veneration which has enabled them for ages, to rule men as they pleased, and fill their own pockets with the wealth of those who might, had they known the "mischiefs" of the "scientific practice," have retained and enjoyed it. But no, this "over stimulation" was "by the steam and scalding portions of a now popular empiricism."

Hitherto the Doctor has had our deep sympathy; but he begins to touch us in a tender place. We must feel out our *bump of combativeness*.

"The bare mention of this latter cause, may, to some, seem invidious; but I trust I shall be shielded from all such imputations by you and those who know me, and are acquainted with the sphere of private practice in which I move; a society far elevated above the influence of vulgar infatuation, both by intelligence and moral worth; yet, in addressing you, the guardians of the class which requires protection from the arts of designing or misguided impostors, acting upon their native or acquired imbecility, I feel officially bound to render the outlines of the reasoning and facts upon which my declaration is founded."


Baltimore Thomsonians, how do you relish the charges, that yours is the influence of vulgar infat-

uation; that you are designing or misguided impostors, acting upon native or acquired imbecility; [acquired imbecility!] that your patients are of the class which requires the guardian protection of the society far elevated above the vulgar infatuation, "by both intelligence and moral worth," in which it is the honor, the pride and the profit of Dr. Miller to move? We know not what you have done with yourselves of *late*; but we are well assured that he *once* thought not a few of you sufficiently intelligent and moral, to be deemed honorable and profitable members of his society. We shrewdly suspect that is only because your intelligence is risen above the "misguidance" of believing that the artful concealment of the rankest poisons under the "deceptive" cloak of dead Latin, Greek, and high-sounding medical science, can render them not only harmless to the human body, but suitable to restore that impaired vitality to which, in its best estate, they are most deadly hostile, that you are not as blindly and obediently as ever attached to his train and receiving his blessing.

"The cases enumerated in the accompanying tabular view, under the head of Thompsonalgia, (pardon the new coined term,) are such only as were traceable to the effects of this system of malpractice, upon the most trivial indisposition; those that have been injured or rendered incurable by the same means, were they segregated, would constitute a most appalling amount, but they are diffused through the table and not particularly marked."

The "*artful*" structure of this paragraph, would lead the unsuspecting reader to suppose that more than half of the Doctor's business was to cure "Thompsonalgia." But his "*art*" is easily detected.



One of the prominent doctrines of "the science of medicine" is, with a few exceptions, that two distinct diseases cannot exist and be in force in the system at the same time. On this doctrine are based the well known practice of salivation, and the whole system of "alteratives," "counter irritants," "counter poisons," "depletions," in short, we had almost said the entire remedial practice; "for," says Dr. Barton, "all our most valuable remedies are poisons." Now, since, in his table of cases, Dr. Miller has given *other names* to all the cases but *eleven*, which he says were "traceable to the effects" of "Thompsonalgia," we have proved [secundum artem medicinæ] according to the medical art, that only *eleven* cases were properly referable to the effects of Thompsonalgia. The fact is, doubtless, that he particularly marked with this term, all the cases of disease on patients who had ever taken a dose of that vile  "powder called No. 6, discovered by the scientific Dr. Cole, in 1832. [*Palmam qui meruit &c.*] Give the palm to whom it is due. The Doctor here cites the following CASE OF QUACKERY:

In order to illustrate the "mischiefs" of the Thomsonian Practice, he says,

"A young, athletic, and generally healthy journeyman mechanic, from the land of steady habits, on a Saturday evening, after quitting work, mentioned his intention of taking a dose of salts to obviate a slight inconvenience he experienced, but his employer being one of the Thomsonian enthusiasts, who are determined to let slip no opportunity of practice, insisted that in lieu of salts, he must take a course of their treatment; to this he objected, but at last being made to understand

most unequivocally, that he must either submit or lose employment, he most reluctantly yielded consent, under the belief that it would be unwise to lose his place for the difference between two doses of medicine; accordingly he swallowed their No. 6; after a very restless night, he was really unwell, hot stuffs were repeated until his mouth and throat became so parched he could swallow no more; he was then subjected to the steam-bath, until he became so emaciated and debilitated, that fearing his immediate dissolution he was informed that all his pecuniary resources were exhausted, and he must be sent to the Alms-house. On admittance here, he was excessively attenuated; his lips, mouth and fauces, were inflated to a red flannel aspect, and he complained at every breath he drew, felt as if he were inhaling flames; his pulse was small and frequent; his tongue was small, painted and blood-red; the glands of his mouth, jaws and neck were tumid; his stomach could receive or retain nothing; he had a colliquative diarrhœa, and complained of the most agonizing pains throughout the whole frame, and especially along the alimentary canal. Every thing we could devise for his relief was unavailing, he rapidly sunk, and as long as he was able to articulate, cursed the Thomsonians and their practice.

On post mortem examination, the only thing worthy of particular remark was the alimentary tube, which was greatly injected, and in many places sphacilated [mortified] from the lower to the upper extremity; proving incontestibly, that death had been the result of the entire arrest of the sources of nutrition, in consequence of the alimentary organs being thrown into a condition incapable of retaining or digesting food."

It must be admitted that this is a most agonizing account. But it were easy to show that the "injected state of the alimentary tube, and the arrest of the sources of nutrition," were the effects, of the "*devices for his relief*," after he entered the Almshouse. For the sake of driving the Doctor to his extremity, however, we will let it stand as it is, and oppose to it examples of the regular scientific practice."

A robust, healthy lady who had never been sick a week in her life, took a violent cold. The first Doctor, A, gave her calomel and its concomitants *nine times*, when she was so weak she could not stand alone. He then told her that the *violence of the disease was subdued*, she must take a little light, nourishing food and she would soon recover her strength. Not finding this declaration true, she applied to Doctor B, who said her disease was dyspepsia, and he furnished her plentifully with blue pills and ordered a cracker and milk diet. After this course Dr. C prescribed Hickory lye and *pepperteas*, (monstrous! but he was an M. D. of the first water, so Doctor M. must suppress his indignation or go by himself to vent it.) This did some good, but the Doctor became sick himself and Dr. D was called. By this time the vital power was so reduced that the heat and the circulation were chiefly confined to the chest and brain, where much pain was felt. As she was too weak to be bled, blisters were applied to the head, neck and chest and repeated in the same places, till, in some of them, the frame work began to appear! In this condition she applied to us. We gave her no encouragement, but she had heard so much of our success in such cases, that she begged us to 'try,' especially as she had just learned that the Doctor who was so kindly

soothing her path to the "quiet grave," with blister upon blister, had said that "she must shortly die;—nothing could save her!" We gave her preparatory medicine that night, the next day a course, and called the third morning. With tears in her eyes she said she felt much better, but that the Doctor had called [he had not been there for three days before we went,] and was very angry at her for "calling in a quack." About a dozen of her *kindest friends*, on whom (after spending a decent living upon doctors) she was dependent for support, (her business was sewing which her daughters and apprentices carried on during her illness,) had called and told her that, if she did not quit the steaming system, which the blister doctor had said would kill her, (after saying she would die of his blisters,) "they would withdraw all their patronage and personal kindness!" (Here, Dr. Miller, was humanity for you, with a vengeance!) But that, if she would quit the steam, they would send her immediately "a doctor that would cure her." She, therefore, hoped that we would not be offended if she asked us to withdraw a while, that this new doctor might have an opportunity for experiment; but requested us to promise, *in case of his failure*, to come again, as she would then have a sufficient excuse for employing us! We told her that we should never be offended at the exercise of a patient's right to choose his own physician; but we could not promise to attend again. We gathered our medicines and quit. It is but just, to say that those benevolent individuals never sent their physician, nor manifested any great concern for the patient. How she recovered we know not, but we saw her a year afterwards in comfortable health. We give this as a specimen

of "regular practice," and also of the manner in which Thomsonian patients "abandon their quackery too late for benefit by scientific prescriptions." No doubt Dr. Miller's cases of "Thompsonalgia," were mostly traceable to the effects of this system of mal-practice." [Traceable to effects! What a scientific and logical expression! But Doctors always aim at the effects—the cause is not understood.]

2d. Till the age of eighteen, our oldest brother was as "athletic and healthy" as any young man that was ever bred in "the land of steady habits." He caught the measles. Being 100 miles from HIS MOTHER, he called the Doctor, who gave him calomel and drew the disease inward. Further prescriptions produced a great tumor on his neck which called for a surgical operation. He was now suspected of scrofula, though that disease had never been heard of among his ancestors, time immemorial. During the eight years succeeding the first attack, he was attended by about twenty doctors, no two of whom *exactly* agreed respecting the nature of the disease or the propriety of the preceding treatment! No doubt, however, that he had the scrofula, for the bones of his fingers and thumb rotted and came out, and his whole system smelled strong of the *mercury* with which he had been often salivated! Learning that he "had the consumption and must die," we repaired to him, with a determination to render his last days as comfortable as the nature of the case would admit. While the skin did not want marks to show the *kind* attentions of the doctors, the hip and shoulder bone had *uncovered their heads*, to speak of the neglect of the nurse. He could scarcely walk, was so poor that, though upwards of six feet high,

we (weighing 130 lbs.,) could easily carry him across the room on our extended arms. Among other symptoms of his disease, we remarked that his food, especially if solid, gave him exceeding pain through the whole "alimentary tube." The phlegm blocked up the bronchiæ and rendered "respiration short and labored." The paroxysms of pain in the alimentary canal, being frequent and severe, he remarked—"I shall go off in some of these turns"—what if you do? "I want you to have me opened and a certificate given of my disease; for my physicians have never understood it! His request was regarded. Slight inflammation of the lungs about the insertion of the bronchiæ; adhesion of the pericardium to the sternum; the mucus membrane of the stomach—yes, the whole alimentary canal destroyed, and the whole extent of the intestines lined with nodes or lumps, from the size of a pullet's egg, down to the smallest, in many places almost preventing the passage of the food which had caused for years all the agonizing pains in these viscera! It was the opinion of the operator, a surgeon of no mean rank, that these nodes were caused by the injudicious exhibition of strong medicines!

Here the reader may learn the commencement of our aversion to the 'scientific practice of medicine,' and the fact that our present opposition to it, is not chargeable to the 'misrepresentations' of Dr. Thomson, or any one else. All that we have ever seen of it since, has only served to convince us more and more, that "destruction and misery are in its path."

"Mankind never grow wiser by the impositions practised upon them by pretenders in medicine; deception follows deception upon vulgar credulity so

rapidly, that it seems to generate a kind of morbid appetite for imposition, which forms a habit of being duped, which, like all other habits, becomes incurable."

Mankind grow wise enough by the impositions practised upon them by pretenders in medicine, to abandon their errors, as is abundantly evident from their successive rejection of the various false theories and mischievous practices, which, at different periods, have obtained among the "regular faculty;" but, in order to prevent "deception from following deception," and the "generation of that morbid appetite for imposition," which has become "so habitual" in the United States, as to present the strongest fortress for the protection of the medical faculty, and barrier against the universal diffusion of the Thomsonian Practice, the *mirror of truth* must be presented to the eyes of the mind. In the accomplishment of this last great object, the Thomsonians are so industriously engaged, that the Doctor will soon have as little reason to complain that "the (people's) habits of being duped, have become incurable, as he will that his "self-limited diseases," and the chronic effects of his "mal-practice," till the "patients have exhausted their funds and the skill of their physicians," and "turned out as hopeless," have become so.

Yes, Doctor, 'deception has followed deception,' because your profession never exhibited the truth. 'The morbid appetite' was formed by eating sources of disease, instead of remedies, and the 'habit' was the hopeless despair of ever finding any thing better.

'If the whole learned, diligent and benevolent medical faculty, (said and still say many of the

people,) have determined that their various theories and practices, are the best that ever have been devised, it is useless for us, ignorant as we are of the human system and the nature and properties of remedies, to think of finding a better:—we must take this or none.’ But many infer, from the general benevolence of the Great Author of their being, and the liberal provision he has made for all their other wants, that he could not have, and has not, forgotten that without which all his other favors are but as loaves suspended before a man upon a gibbet—viz. a simple, sure, safe and universal remedy for all the vast varieties of pain. In this opinion, they are sustained by the concurrence of some of the greatest and best men that ever adorned the medical profession. This belief and the notorious fact that nature generally gets along better with her diseases, *alone*, than when the majority of your craft interrupt her operations, have led to those trials of simple remedies by the people themselves, which, in the exaltation of your professional dignity, you are pleased to style ‘empiricism,’ and ‘quackery.’ But lastly, Doctor, and your ‘Report’ affords the most conclusive evidence that you believe it as firmly as we, the prevalence and success of the Thomsonian System of Medical Practice, encourage us in the full and firm belief that this System, unlike all the foaming and crested billows of former times, to burst with a crash and remand us to the tumult of opposite currents, just as they flattered us with a hope that they were nearing us to the shore, is the silent but broad and deeply rolling surge, that shall land us safe above the reach forever of reaction and delusion.

‘But, among the innumerable schemes of medi-



cal abuse which have disgraced the annals of humanity, we have rarely been presented with any more mischievous in itself, or widely destructive in its tendencies, than that which is now so industriously and enthusiastically propagating in this country, under the name of the 'Thomsonian.'

Here the Doctor wakes us up to something like a serious inquiry. We must examine the results of his practice, and compare them with what we have seen of the Thomsonian, and if there be found the shadow of truth in the above charge, we must drop the quill, the pepper and steam, and go at a more humane, if not a more honorable calling.

On inspection of the report, we perceive that it contains a table of the medical and surgical cases treated within the preceding year, with the names of the diseases, the cures, reliefs, deaths, and retentions for further prescriptions or operations. We have not room for the whole table. The total admissions to medical practice are 2571; total cures 2076; relieved 111; died 244; on hand 130. Thus we see that, of the whole number received to medical treatment, four-fifths *were cured, and a little less than one out of ten died*. Of the remainder, one in every twenty-one was '*relieved*,' [to a few this was all that was wanted,] and one in every seventeen yet remains. But, as another table informs us that *only 1154 persons were received* into the Almshouse during the year, and that there were only 447 in the house at the beginning, that 48 died *without medical aid, the true state* of the medical department stands thus:—1154 less 48 leaves 1106 *persons* on whom the doctor operated, and out of whom he lost 244. This leaves a death for less than ever *five persons* under his care. But it is *not reasonable* to suppose that more than

three-fourths of the persons *admitted* to the Alms-house, were placed under the care of the physician; all the *poor* are not *always* sick. Probably, then, one-third, *certainly* one-fourth of all the persons that were subjected to medical treatment, actually *died*; and, of the 130 *persons* remaining sick, doubtless a large proportion would afterwards die. But the fourth, in all conscience, is enough.

We may here be asked how the 'attending physician,' managed to have so many 'cases' and 'diseases,' among so small a number of persons—only 1156 persons admitted, and six more left than found! 2571 cases among 1154 persons, (add 447 in the house at first, would be 1601; but, as 453 were still left for the next year's operations, and 48 died without medical aid, these ought not to be counted at all.) Of the 1106, probably not more than three-fourths or 820 were doctored at all. This makes more than three cures to each patient; yet many staid so short a time that the total average in the house per month, was only 508.

We answer, he did it *secundum artem*, as is manifest from several items in the table. For example, there are 27 cases of dropsy. These no doubt commenced with acute fevers which were subdued by bleeding, starving, cooling and physicking, till the patient was 'relieved,' when he was left to nature and the nurse. As these refreshed him a little, he began to go about, when he was marked 'cured.' Presently the fluids of the body began to increase; but, for want of that warmth and action in the secretory vessels, which had been destroyed by the cooling process, they remained in cysts or the cellular substance, and received a new

name, by which process the fever was cured and a new 'case' was added to the list under the proper head! In like manner eruptive diseases were changed to 'abscesses,' dysentery or cholera morbus, to 'enteritis,' or inflammation of the bowels &c. Hence we see why it appears, by the table, that so large a proportion of the acute attacks are marked 'cured,' while most of the 'deaths,' 'reliefs,' and 'remainings,' are chronic. The violent efforts of nature against the sudden invasions of disease, are subdued by the club of depletion &c.; she rests awhile in insensibility, and then her feeble and inefficient efforts are called chronic, and receive some other hard name which fully screens the doctor from all blame for not curing them. Of this class we have 11 cases of "arachnitis"—inflammation of the spider web membrane, of which only three were cured and eight died; "cancer," three cases, *all* died; cholera, 7 cases, 6 died; dropsy, 27 cases, 12 died; "chronic enteritis," inflammation of the bowels, 23 cases, 14 died. Fevers, puerperal, 7 cases, 4 died; typhoid, 18 cases, 11 died; gangrene of the lungs, 2 cases, both died; chronic liver complaint, 5 cases, 2 died; dropsy in the brain, 2 cases, both died; marasmus, decline or gradual wasting away without fever or apparent disease, 16 cases, 8 died. *Ptyalism, salivation*, 1 case, died; scrofula, 9 cases, 3 died; not one cured. We have here mentioned some of "the most mischievous," widely destructive and prolific "sources" of death, indicated in the table; some were universally fatal; of others, though not all died, few or none were cured: the average is, of 131 cases, not persons, remember; some of them may have been marked "cured" before, but now taken again with the *same disease*; or, as an honest,

simple Thomsonian, one who had not "science" enough to contrive the "art" of averaging three "cures" out of *one* patient, would say, "RELAPSED and died." Of these 131 "cases," thus "*artfully*" made out, 74, or more than half *died*, and many of the rest are not cured.

Now let us prove the Doctor's assertion that "Thompsonalgia" should be ranked "among" these "prolific sources" of death.

Of all the "2571 cases" of disease, it seems only ELEVEN "were traceable," to the effects of this system of mal-practice [of taking Dr. Cole's "celebrated powder called No. 6,"] all the rest being "particularly marked" with some other name.— Of these eleven desperate cases the Doctor found himself able to kill only 2, (*less than one-fifth*) though he declares that "every thing he could devise," was done for them. No man in his senses will doubt for a moment that the patient who can survive all the bleeding, poisoning, physieking, blistering, cooling and starving that a learned doctor "can devise," deserves (like the witches of olden time who could not be drowned) to be instantly and unceremoniously hanged! 3 in every 10 of all those diseases, in favor of *Thompsonalgia*!

As the Trustees of the Baltimore Almshouse will perceive that this famous "powder No. 6" renders patients so invulnerable to the mischiefs of "mal-practice," that less than one-fifth of those who had taken it died under the "device" of the "attending physician," while at least one-third died in the whole amount, and more than one-half of the worst cases, we respectfully suggest to them the propriety of employing, next year, a skilful Thomsonian for an "attending physician." If

they should not find it "popular" to do this, we hope they will at least require the addition to the medical report of two columns, containing the number of *persons* treated, and the number of *times* each person was "*cured*." Thus the whole will present to the inspection of the public, less of "designing art," and more of honest truth, than the present.

Now let us compare this scientific asylum practice, with that of Thomsonian Infirmeries, and show which is the most worthy of confidence.

It will be admitted that while such fibs are told about the practice by those who ought to know better, as those of which the report before us is chiefly composed, few will resort to them till they have "exhausted the skill of (the fashionable) physicians" and lost all hope of relief from any other source.

## INFIRMARY PRACTICE.

During the first sixteen months of Dr. Benjamin Thomson's practice in Boston, he gave "more than 1500 courses to more than 1000 patients, and lost BUT ONE.—T. R., vol. 2, page 240. In Concord, N. H., he has since been more successful, having done more business and lost NONE.—Vol. 4, pa. 113—14.

Dr. N. P. Tatem, of Norfolk, Va., says, August 29, 1834: Of more than one hundred cases of various diseases, he has lost but one, an infant.—Vol. 3, pa. 58.

Dr. Hiram Platt, of Hartford, Conn., says, Oct. 9, 1834, that he has administered 173 full courses to 49 patients, and lost but one, a *chronic Bronchitis*, incurable by the M. D's. Vol. 3, page 78.

Messrs. Nash & Tatem, of the Norfolk, Va., Infirmary, say, Jan. 9, 1835, "During the year, we have received more than 600 patients, exhibiting the greatest variety of disease; except about 30, all had previously tried the mineral practice. Ten have died out of the 600, of consumption, dropsy and cholera."—Vol. 3, page 129, see also 163.

Dr. Metcalf, of South Hadley, Mass., says, (Feb. 18, 1835,) during the year he has had 200 patients, mostly given over to die, or abandoned as incurable. Only three died, two of consumption, one of fever; all considered incurable.—Vol. 3, pa. 181; see also pas. 231—3.

Dr. Benjamin Thompson, of Boston, Mass., says, (May 9, 1834,) of all the cases of Asiatic Cholera which have occurred in Boston, I have attended about *one-half*, without the loss of a single patient, though I have not heard of a single patient saved who was attended by the Cholera Hospital Doctors.—Vol. 2, pa. 287—8. Dr. Miller didn't lose but 6 out of 7 cases of this disease.

Dr. Wesley T. Newman, of Mount Crawford, Rockingham County, Va., says, (May 1, 1835,) "The cases of sickness attended by the members of our Society, amount to upwards of 1000, and but one death in that number.—Vol. 3, page 282.

The Thomsonian Society of Meeklenburg County, Va., state that of 100 cases of scarlet fever; they lost all but—99! while the M. D's. cured 66 out of about as many.

Dr. Thos. Neill, of Xenia, Ohio, now at our elbow, states that he has had more than 600 patients, and not yet lost one.

But we are tired of quoting. Where we have

spoken of Infirmaries, we have not included the "private practice." We will give that when Dr. Miller gives his. We hope the reader will turn to the places above quoted, and read the full reports, as we have generally taken the substance without giving the language, and the details of cases are deeply interesting.

We should scarcely know how to believe the above reports, had not just such things come under our own observation. In all our practice since September 29, 1832, we have never lost a patient *on whom we were the first, the continued and the ONLY practitioner in the case.* We have never lost a case at all in our Infirmary, either in Richmond or Columbus. Since our arrival here (though we wish to practise only enough to illustrate our instructions to students,) we and our assistant have given upwards of 120 courses of medicine, besides effecting many cures by more simple prescriptions. Two patients to whom we have been called in consultation have died, but we have saved several others that were supposed to be dying. If the failure of their attendants to cure the two, be attributed to the inefficacy of the System, we remark that, as the mineral practice had previously destroyed the firmest portions of their bodies, (the teeth, of which there was not a sound one in either head) we have no reason to suppose that the more delicate, digestive, respiratory and secretive organs were less injured or more capable of renewal; especially as the 'mercurial fetor' fully confirmed our suspicions. While we exhibit these failures here, and confess that we failed to cure a number of worn out and abandoned cases in Virginia, it is but justice to ourselves to remark that our object, from the beginning, being rather to

test the full power of the medicines, than to gain credit or money for wonderful cures, we took hold of all sorts of cases, even those that we had good reason to suppose were in the very jaws of death. But we positively declare, and can easily prove, that, for one case that we lost even of these, we have cured ten that were either said to be dying or abandoned as incurable, by the regular M. D's. We have cured cases that had defied the skill of the most eminent physicians from Maine to Georgia, *and we can do it again.*

It is somewhat remarkable that, though we have treated almost all the *ises, oses, copuses, odyne, agras, algias, isms* [ptyal-] *alises*, [incuri-] *dyses, cacos, catas, &c.*, with which the "highly cultivated and progressively improving science of medicine" is encumbered, we have never met with a single case of the *new disease* called "*Thompsonalgia.*"

Dr. Miller states that the Thomsonian practice leads to intemperance. How this new and strange charge may be sustained we know not; but we know that Dr. Thomson, both in principle and practice, is an uncompromising enemy of intemperance; and we find neither in his system nor the practice of any of its ablest supporters, any imitation of the regular practice of prescribing to dyspeptics "weak brandy toddy to create an appetite." At all events this comes with a bad grace from a doctor who had required the trustees to furnish the Almshouse averaging only 508 persons a month, with more than 170 gallons of ardent spirits per annum. See Report. The Doctor says, "these Thomsonians insist that *heat is life*, and that the more heat the more life; and, in their zeal to generate heat, they often times sublime life



into immortality." We answer, those regulars insist that heat is death, and in their zeal to cool it, they reduce the temperature of the body to a level with that of the earth, six feet below the surface, in the proportion of fifty to one that the Thomsonians sublime. He says that the regulars "in the exuberance of human sensibility and virtue, *forego* the *pleasurable* and the *profitable* paths of life, for *no other reward* than the pleasure arising from the consciousness of alleviating the miseries and woes of suffering fellow beings." Not to mention the notorious fact that doctors have hitherto generally acquired vast fortunes in a short time, we are constrained to ask what Dr. M. means by his other remarks, about "the sphere of intelligence and moral worth in which he moves," the "patients who have exhausted their *funds* and the skill of their *physicians*, and in this *forlorn* predicament, are sent here to obtain quiet graves." Where was the 'property' of these, and the 'humanity' of their physicians, the 'exuberance of their sensibility and virtue?' The former is doubtless in the coffers of the compassionate and benevolent doctors, and the latter is evidently all poured out in wrath against the man from whose practice was snatched the Thomsonian patient about whose 'alimentary tube' so much fuss is made! But, with all his 'designing art,' to conceal it, the Doctor has let out the true secret. He says, "This Thomsonian delusion [of imitating and aiding nature in curing disease, and thus avoiding lingering sufferings, and the devices and expense of doctors,] has been but too common and *detri- mental to the science and practice* of medicine;" he is afraid that it "will destroy the science that already exists, and arrest all further inquiry into,

and improvement of it; throw the the most *refined and beuevolent* profession [that foregoes all pleasure and profit, and sends its rifled and 'forlorn patients to the Alms-house'] into the hands of illiterate and unscientific men, who are so ignorant as not to know their own incompetency, and so reckless as to jeopardize human life for the sake of a compensation, no greater than they could obtain by cobbling old shoes." Here is the rub.—The Thomsonians are about to destroy so much of our superstitious advantages of Greek, Latin, Chemistry, and *post mortem* examinations, and to disseminate so generally, their *vulgar notion* that there is no more mystery or skill or expense, required for curing all their diseases, than for fitting a shoe to every foot; that all the pleasure hitherto derived from the respect paid us, for our superior attainments and our medical *infallibility*, together with the enormous tax we have levied on the people as a punishment for their blind adherence to our *dicta*, are about to vanish, when we must "be diffused through the" great "table" of society "AND NOT PARTICULARLY MARKED."

When the Doctor discovers how we have "used him up," he will doubtless avail himself of a little more of his "designing art." He will declare it beneath his dignity and that of "the sphere of practice in which he moves" to condescend to notice us *in public*. He will declare that we have made "mistakes in the items," and that, therefore, our "general conclusions are *incorrect* and unworthy of credit." (He will not say *we went beyond the truth*; he knows better.) But these disclaimers will not suit us; the only correction we will admit is an "*artless*" table, containing the additional columns, showing the number of *persons* as well as ca-

ses and diseases, and the *number oftimes each person* was 'cured,' during his stay in the Asylum.—We should be glad also to know how *long* each patient staid in the institution; but, as this would require much room, we dispense with it. If such a table prove us wide of the mark, we will cheerfully make the proper correction.

With our best respects Dr. Miller, will please to accept the assurance that the above is only a little "powder of No. 6," intended to arrest the gangrene that has commenced about the "tongue," if not the "fauces;" that, whenever he thinks proper again to meddle with our "popular empiricism," we intend to turn the key, and let out upon him "the steam and scalding portions," in their perfection and power, with "all their mischievous and most destructive tendencies."

---

*Intemperance.*—In answer to Dr. Miller's Philippic against their intemperance, the Baltimore Thomsonians say,

"That the Thomsonian remedies gratify the 'strongest propensities of the imbecile and uninformed,' is a daring and reckless libel upon the truth. No intemperate person drinks No. 6, from choice—whiskey is too plenty and much cheaper; and if Thomsonians desire a stimulant they resort to Cayenne."

"So far as the occasional use of No. 6 is concerned in "inducing confirmed intemperance," (and ardent spirits or Alcohol, are used more sparingly by Thomsonians than the regular faculty) we are perfectly willing, *as a body*, to be compared with our opponents, without any apprehension

that, in point of temperance, *in all things*, they will bear the palm. Let Dr. Miller muster the regulars, and we will muster the irregulars, or law-denounced. We are willing to abide the decision of honest judges of his own appointment."

"How could the medical treatment in the Almshouse be successfully prosecuted, if pepper and whiskey, alcohol and wine, (the latter we presume is for the dinner table of the Doctor and his aids,) were prohibited; for the trustees' statement shows, that during twelve months, ending on the 30th of April, 1835, there were used, as *hospital stores*, ordered by said Dr. Miller,

33½	gallons	Alcohol; equaling in first proof spirits,	82
7	do.	Brandy, (4th proof we presume,)	7
44½	do.	Whiskey, - - - -	44½
31	do.	Port Wine, - - - -	31
6	do.	Teneriffe, - - - -	6
Gallons			170½

*Besides the following thirst-creating stimulants:*

521 lbs. Tobacco  
 200 lbs. Snuff  
 10 bottles Cayenne Pepper  
 77 lbs. black Pepper

This we dedicate to the Temperance Society without further comment."

The Baltimore Thomsonians argued very justly, that, on account of the superior cleanliness of the Almshouse, and the abundant comforts provided for its inmates, the practice there ought to have been far more successful than theirs, among the

same class in the city, whereas it was, in fact, incomparably less so.

To exhibit the comparative merits of the regular practice and their own, they give the following table, which sets the matter forever at rest.

“The Thomsonian right-holders in this city, considerably exceed the number of the regular faculty, and their families generally are greater in number. When any of the members of the regular faculty are sick, no doubt exists that their utmost skill and care are called in requisition to save them. Yet the deaths in their families greatly outnumber those of the system “so widely destructive” of life, as may be seen by the following statement, of the correctness of which we can fully satisfy the regulars.”

Deaths in families of Regulars.		In families of Thomsonians.
1834,	23	5
1835,	18	3
1836, Jan. 30,	2	0
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total,	43	8

This requires no further comment.”

---

## BOTANICO-MEDICAL SCHOOLS.

### *Arguments in favor of Their Establishment.*

As a member of the committee appointed by the Convention of T. B. Physicians, lately held in Cincinnati, to draft a preamble and resolution, setting forth the reasons for the establishment of a Botanico-Medical College, we presented the following: See T. R., vol. IV, pa. 225.

## PREAMBLE AND RESOLUTION.

Whereas, the continual fluctuations in the theories and practices of the healing art, and the uniform destruction of the human race, that has, in all ages and countries, attended the practice of the experimenting advocates of those theories, clearly demonstrate that, whatever be the preventive or the curative principles and processes designed by a benevolent Creator for the government of the medical practitioner, in the exercise of the healing art, the class of men styled the "Regular Medical Faculty," have not discovered them; and *whereas*, the Thomsonian System of Medical Practice is more consistent with reason and common sense, more accordant in its simplicity and adaptation to the condition and wants of the whole human family, with the wisdom and benevolence of design, evident in all the other works of the great Architect and Governor of the universe; Whereas, we have the most abundant and satisfactory moral evidence that this system of practice is far more efficacious in the prevention and cure of disease, even when administered by the illiterate and inexperienced, and incomparably more so, in the hands of the intelligent, judicious and experienced, than any other, exercised at other times or in other places; and the most convincing ocular demonstration, that its success immeasurably surpasses that of any and every other system practised within the compass of our observation: Whereas, this System is daily suffering unmerited neglect or shameless scandal and abuse, where thousands are perishing for want of its application, in consequence of its adulteration by the admixture of hypotheses totally adverse to the true principles of the

curative art, and of agents and means either inefficiently aiding or diametrically opposing the sanative operations of the vital powers: And *whereas* we, the friends of this System, in convention assembled, are fully and firmly convinced that one of the best, if not the very best means to disseminate through the community all the inestimable blessings which it is capable of imparting, is to establish, somewhere on or near the Ohio River, a School or College in which may be stationed men of talents, science, experience and moral worth, capable of teaching and illustrating the true principles of the healing art—of pointing out the deficiencies and errors of their ordinary application, and guarding the young practitioner and the people against the adoption of medical theories, and the use of medical agents or means that are ruinous to the human constitution and destructive to the vital energies, and to connect with it an Infirmary in which the afflicted may receive the best possible attention, and the student may be taught the practical details of the healing art; Therefore,

*Resolved*, That it is of the first importance and altogether expedient, to establish, on or near the Ohio River, at Marietta or Louisville, or some intermediate point to be selected by the committee chosen for that purpose, a Thomsonian Medical School and Infirmary, for the purposes to which allusion is made in the latter part of the above preamble.

---

At the request of the Convention, we presented the following

## FACTS AND ARGUMENTS,

*To sustain the foregoing Preamble and Resolution.*

Perhaps some may ask, Why all this zeal and effort for the dissemination of new principles and modes of practice in the science of Medicine? Has not this science been cultivated with untiring diligence by men of the most splendid talents and extensive acquirements, in all ages and countries since the world began?

We promptly and cheerfully admit that this is unquestionable; but, If it be *therefore* contended that the science is brought to perfection and susceptible of no further improvement, or even that it is founded on an imperishable basis, we beg leave respectfully to enter our protest against such conclusions.

Would it have been reasonable for a cotemporary of Robert Fulton to contend that, because the pressure of oars in the water, and of wind upon a sail, had been the only modes of propelling vessels upon the seas, lakes and rivers, from the commencement of the world to that hour, *therefore*, these were the only modes in which it could be done *thereafter*, and that the idea of moving floating houses with great velocity, by the power of vapor or steam, was a mere utopian dream, that could never have fulfillment? Not to multiply comparisons which are innumerable, but to present a striking analogy closely interwoven with the subject under consideration, might not the same objectors, with equal propriety, ask why the zeal and effort lately manifested in our capital, to establish throughout our whole country, institutions for the express purpose of teaching the *very art of teaching*? If, after



having taught themselves and one another for nearly six thousand years, the literary world have, at this late day, to learn the very art of teaching and learning, is it at all to be wondered at, if some of the *sciences* which they have been so long and assiduously cultivating, should be found defective or even absurd? Nay, is not this conduct a tacit admission that their former notions of both moral and intellectual philosophy, are essentially and radically wrong? Whether they admit it or not, it would require little time, labor or talent to prove the fact; but we will not attempt it till we find some one willing to exhibit the obtuseness of his perceptive faculties, on render himself an object of compassion to an enlightened public, by making a speech in opposition to the benevolent views and praiseworthy exertions of the society of teachers and friends of improvement in education, lately formed in the State of Ohio. Dr. Bigelow, a professor in Cambridge, Mass., lately remarked, in an address to the Massachusetts Medical Society, that, whatever had been the changes or improvements in medical theories, the *art of curing* disease had made few advances for the last fifty years.

In submitting this preamble and resolution to the Convention, Mr. President, and endeavoring to sustain every proposition in them by facts and arguments that cannot be set aside, I remark—

1. That Medical Theories and Practices have ever been in fluctuation, may be proved by quotations from every standard work on medical history. Take Dr. Thacher for example.

“The Egyptian medicine,” says Thacher, “appears to have been little else than a collection of absurd superstitions.”—3.—“Hippocrates studied

and followed nature."—4.—"Galen introduced false and chimerical theories, and indulged in the most extravagant disputations respecting medical subjects; yet, for about fourteen centuries, his doctrines and systems were most sacredly adhered to, and revered by all descriptions of men."—4—5.—Though he rejected the use of all medical poisons, yet so surprising were some of the cures he performed, that his skill was ascribed to "magic."—"Paracelsus laid the foundation of a chemical system directly opposed to that of Galen, which he resolved to subvert." "His principal remedies were antimony, mercury, and opium."—5. Hervey's splendid discovery of the circulation of the blood, subverted the fallacious doctrines of the ancients and at once effected a total revolution in the theory and practice of medicine."—7. "From the commencement of medical history, revolutions in the Theories of physic have been exceedingly numerous and fleeting." "Every age has teemed with the controversies of the learned; and, while ambitious projectors, imagined they had attained to perfection, their contemporaries or immediate successors contested their principles and triumphed over their errors; hence, we see theories which scarce survive their authors give place to others as unsubstantial and transient as themselves."—Pages 7, 8. Here the charge of fluctuation is fully sustained.

II. The preamble states that great destruction to human life, has been the result of practices founded upon these fluctuating theories. In the view of facts disclosed by dissections, Dr. Rush exclaims, "What destruction to human life, has not been made under the influence of false theories!" Many eminent physicians have declared that expe-

riments in obedience to false theories have destroyed more lives than the sword, pestilence and famine. During the reign of the cholera in this fertile valley, a physician remarked, "We have drawn blood enough to float a steamboat and given calomel enough to freight her." Was there any other need of the presence of disease than simply to afford an excuse for these "experimenters under false theories," in order to effect the destruction of the thousands that died under the combined influence of this disease, and the scientific practice of medicine?

III. The preamble states that the medical faculty have not even yet, discovered any thing worthy to be considered the curative principles and processes designed by the benevolent Creator and Governor of the universe, for the direction of the medical practitioner in the exercise of the healing art.

To prove this position, we must first enquire what we have a right to expect as the ultimatum of perfection in the prevention and cure of disease. This point we must settle by analogy. We must consider the nature and extent of the provisions made by the same benevolent being, for the other wants of his frail, needy creatures, and thus, by comparison, draw our conclusions respecting the provisions made for the preservation of life and health.

The three great wants of man are food, raiment and medicine.

As to food and raiment, though milk, bread and meat, are sufficient for the former, and flax and wool and skins for the latter, yet nothing can exceed, even in imagination, the actual provision made for the full supply of every real want, of every in-

habitant of the earth. Not content with providing the mere necessities of food and raiment, the Divine benevolence, with a most profuse and lavish hand, has scattered in the richest abundance, all over the habitable earth, every luxury in either of these respects, that can gratify the taste or give pleasure to the eye; and which, in the most enticing manner, invite the needy wanderer to stretch forth the hand and pluck them. The most delightful fruits and viands and vegetables, are superadded to the necessary food, and all the various forms of cotton, silks, furs &c., to the clothing, till the heart can scarcely desire or the imagination conceive, any gratification that is not provided. When we consider the fact that the *simplest form of any one* of this infinite variety of provisions, is all that is indispensable, we are constrained to ask, Can it be possible that so extensive a provision is made for the ordinary sustenance of the body, that no one of all the human family need starve or freeze to death, and yet that so poor a provision is made for the prevention and cure of disease, that one half of the whole number must die under the age of five years, that the average of all is only thirty, and not one in a hundred arrives at the period when the machine wears out with age? Are food and clothing so much more important to man than life and health, as to justify so great a disproportion in the provision by Him,

Who sees with equal eye, as God of all,  
A hero perish and a sparrow fall?"

It cannot be. There must be somewhere; yes, every where, scattered over the face of this wide world, remedies simple and harmless in their nature,

and as easily obtained by all the suffering sons and daughters of affliction, and as effectual to remove disease, as bread, meat and vegetables are to remove hunger; and flax, wool, cotton, silks, &c., are to protect us from the inclemencies of the seasons.

As, in the providence of God, then, over his creatures, it is an axiom that the minutest supervision and benevolent *provision*, presupposes the greater, and, in his *power* to confer favors, the gift of the greater blessing includes and guarantees that of the less, so it is *morally* as well as rationally demonstrated, that the provision for the prevention and cure of disease, without which, those for food and raiment were worse than useless, (death itself being preferable to a lingering and painful disease,) is as abundant, as extensive, as simple, as efficacious, as those for food and raiment.

Let us now enquire what is the testimony of physicians respecting *their discovery* of such a provision?

"The melancholy triumphs of disease over its victims," says Dr. Thacher, "and the numerous reproachful examples of medical impotency, clearly evince that the combined stock of ancient and modern learning is greatly insufficient to perfect our science." "Far indeed beneath the standard of perfection, it is still fraught with deficiencies, and altogether inadequate to our desires." Dr. Bigelow says, "The records of mortality attest its frequent failures, and the inability to control the event of diseases, is at times felt by the most gifted and experienced practitioners." To many of our most common diseases; as, measles, scarlet fever, whooping cough, rheumatism &c. &c.,

"there is due," says this Doctor, "a certain succession of processes \* \* which may tend to death or recovery, but which are not known to be shortened, or greatly changed by medical treatment." But, while every intelligent and candid physician, thus freely admits and bitterly laments the inefficiency of this art, the more powerful in intellect and independent in principle and moral courage, such as Abercrombie, Linteaud, Rush, Morgagni, Waterhouse, &c. &c., are bold to confess that the whole "*pretended science*" resolves itself into "the art of conjecture," "the science of guessing," "striking in the dark," a scheme of "learned quackery," "a temple unroofed and cracked at the foundation," &c. &c.

These are only specimens of the heart-sickening confessions respecting the inadequacy and pernicious effects of the "regular practice," that may be found on almost every page of every candid author on the history of medicine. But what wonder if their improvements are worthless, seeing they are made, as Lord Bacon says, "in a circle and not in progression?" We contend that the regular systems, from the days of Paracelsus, have been errors themselves, built upon the quicksands of error; the more men *have* heaped or *may* heap upon them, the deeper have they sunken, and will sink, till they be supplanted by correct deductions, founded on the rock of truth. These may be superimposed, without depression, till the structure reach the very circle of the heavens, the perfection of beauty and strength.

It may be objected that disease may often prevail over life, for want of the requisite remedies or their seasonable and judicious application.—So we answer, may it for want of food and raiment,

or *their* seasonable and judicious application.—The man who *will* not obtain and use food or raiment, *may* starve or freeze to death; so may he who will not gather and apply the remedies, fall a victim to disease; but we have proved that the *supplies* for protection against the ravages of disease, are as abundant, simple, and easily applied, as those to guard us against hunger and cold, while the want is far less frequent. The chance then, for long life, is as good as the security for satisfying hunger and preserving a comfortable temperature of the body. If, therefore, the science of medicine does not elevate the security against disease, to an *equality*, at least, with what we know ourselves to possess against cold and hunger, (and we have adduced the most satisfactory evidence to prove that it does not,) it must be conceded that the medical faculty have not discovered the plan and the means devised by a wise and benevolent Providence, for the prevention and cure of disease.

IV. The preamble states that the Thomsonian System and Practice are more consistent with reason and common sense than those of the regular faculty.

A few comparisons will serve to prove this position. A patient takes cold or loses the inward heat, which disturbs the equilibrium of vital action. The repeated efforts of the vital power to regain its full dominion, produces hot flashes, alternating with cold chills, caused by the further encroachments of the disease. The appetite is destroyed, and great debility of the whole system is the consequence. The regular plan is to increase the debility by the compound powers of bleeding, physicking, cooling with nitre and of-

ten ice, stupifying with opium, irritating with blisters and requiring general starvation, till there is not power enough in the system to produce any of those "alarming symptoms," which nature, undisturbed, ever exhibits in her defence against the encroachments of disease. Then this unnatural and senseless conduct is abandoned, and the patient is allowed a little indulgence in the use of light and nourishing diet, which indeed gradually raises the fever again; but, as the patient is, notwithstanding, evidently gaining strength and appetite, this second trespass of Nature is winked at, doubtless because it is never known to be entirely subdued without killing the patient. The fact that many recover, in spite of such cruel treatment, is proof positive that the *vis medicatrix naturæ*, is strongly inclined and often able to guard her much loved citadel, against the combined influence of disease, and of mal-treatment to cure it. Whether the patient, unaided, shall recover from this depressed state, depends on the answer to the question, whether there is still in the system more power to oppose disease, or disease to oppose the sanative operations of the living principle. Whether he can be cured by art, depends on the answer to the question, whether any remedies can be found and applied that will restore the lost balance, so as to leave the living principle nothing to do but repair damages. But, instead of using remedies in harmony with her efforts, the faculty deal out to her the rankest poisons, which, according to their own testimony, "suddenly and rapidly extinguish a great proportion of the vitality of the system."

The Thomsonian finds the patient cold, he raises the heat. There is a disturbed unequal vi-



tal action; he relaxes the channels, removes the local obstructions and restores equilibrium to the temperature and circulation; then, with tonics and nourishment, he brings up the vital action to the healthy standard. Is there local inflammation?—The regular, by depletion, reduces the propelling power of the circulation, so as to prevent it from forcing the arrested morbid matter through its course. Putrefaction succeeds to stagnation, the animal fibre is soon destroyed, and the natural tendency outwards generally forces the morbid matter to the surface, where it produces an ulcer. If nature is not too much opposed in her operations, she commences her healing process in the deep recesses of the injury, and continues it to the surface where she finishes her work. When, however, the cooling and sedative process is carried so far as to overcome the repellent force of the living principle, the morbid matter is drawn inwards, as in white swellings, chalk deposits, and internal abscesses, &c. &c., which often attend, in the character of seconds or followers, the “regular, scientific practice of medicine.” But the Botanic practice relaxes, by warmth and moisture, the part obstructed to its greatest extent, then adds to, instead of subtracting from, the circulating momentum, till the obstructions are softened, broken, moved in their natural channels, and discharged through their appropriate organs. In short, while the scientific practice considers the efforts of the system called fevers, the greatest enemies of life, and does all it can to destroy those efforts, the Botanic deems these efforts of all things most salutary, and counts it the highest honor of the science, and the ultimatum of medical skill, to discover and aid them where they ex-

ist, and to imitate or supply them where they are wanting. It is, therefore, more consistent with reason and common sense, than any other yet devised.

V. The Botanic Practice is based upon the principle that all forms of disease proceed from one cause, viz. obstruction; and of course may be removed by the judicious application of any remedies that experience has taught will remove obstructions. The scientific theorists would have us believe that diseases are numberless; that each requires a separate treatment and different remedies; that the remedies which would cure one would be injurious in another; that of course, so much skill is necessary to distinguish one disease from another, and to apply the proper treatment, as to exclude from the mass of mankind the privilege of removing their diseases as they do hunger and cold or thirst, and to confine this care to a favored few who will not fail to render it subservient to their pecuniary and honorary advantage. Therefore, the former or Botanic System, by requiring the practitioner to know little more of disease than simply that the patient is sick, or of remedies than the fact that a few innocent vegetables that may be obtained any and every where, will, if used in a certain way, relax the collapsed vessels, eject the obstructions, and strengthen the debilitated organs, proves itself better adapted to the condition and wants of the whole human family, than any other system. All men are liable to be sick. If none but a scientific physician, with his hundreds of hair-splitting theories of healthy and unhealthy action, his twenty-five hundred distinctions of diseases, and his twenty thousand remedies can administer relief, millions must

perish! But, if every one can cure disease, according to the Botanic doctrine, not more need perish of that than of hunger, and the wisdom and benevolence of Providence are as conspicuous in providing for the preservation of health and the removal of disease, as in furnishing food and raiment.

VI. We have the most abundant and satisfactory moral evidence that the Botanic or Thomsonian System of Practice is far more efficacious in the hands of intelligent, experienced and judicious men, than any that ever preceded it. To save space and time, we refer, on this head, to the testimonies every where dispersed through the pages and volumes of the Thomsonian Recorder, remarking only here that the harmony of testimony on this subject, from persons of all ranks in society, degrees of talent or education, and peculiar locations and prejudices, differing as widely as the directions of the poles on other subjects, as morals, religion, politics, or intellectual philosophy, is one of the strongest proofs of the truth of the whole, that can be adduced in favor of any testimony.—Historians rely so much upon this for confirmation of the details of past events, that they reject, almost in toto, all such details which it does not corroborate. This harmony of testimony among all the writers of the Scriptures, so unlike in other respects as the fisherman and the publican must have been to the heir of Egypt's learning and the disciple of Gamaliel, is unquestionably one of the strongest *external* evidences of the truth of the Christian religion.

VII. That the Botanic System is by far the most efficacious even in the hands of the most ignorant, the testimonies in the Recorder above alluded to, will abundantly prove.

VIII. "This system is daily suffering unmerited neglect or shameless scandal and abuse," &c.

It is neglected or abused because few men of talents, education, address, experience, leisure, means, moral principle and courage, are found to explain and defend it in the presence of the talent, learning and influence of the multitudes whose interest is to arrest its progress. It is neglected because men know not its value. It is abused because its enemies, by perverting its doctrines and belying the effects of their application, have spread a bad name in advance of its progress. It is also abused for effects produced by its application upon false principles, and in connection with other means and modes totally hostile to its principles and modes of operation, and often sufficient to counteract its salutary tendencies. Hence, multitudes who suffer for its application, refuse to receive it, for want of that evidence of its value which a clear and correct exhibition of its principles and an unmingled and skilful practice would have afforded them.

IX. The friends of this system, aware of the above facts, desire to establish a school and infirmary—for the purposes,

1st, Of instructing young men in the pure principles of the system, and making them acquainted with the nature and character of its remedies in scientific order.

2nd, Of rendering them skilful in the application of these principles and means, in the active, constant and ever-varying business of an extensive Infirmary.

3d, Of teaching them the fallacy of all false doctrines in medical theories, and the mischiefs of the corresponding errors in practice.

4th. Of enabling them to go forth and clearly exhibit to the intelligence of the community, the correctness of our doctrines and the vast superiority of our practice; and to hurl back with merited vengeance, upon the heads of their authors, the libels on truth, and the scandal and abuse that have been so long and successfully heaped upon her lovers and followers; and thus to raise this always smothered and often suppressed system of medicine, to that rank and respectability in society to which its merits entitle it; and to confer on the class of individuals who approve and defend it, who use and exhibit it, that character for benevolence, intelligence and trustworthiness to which they will, *then at least*, have a paramount claim.

5. Into this institution they expect to gather the most talented, scientific, intelligent and skilful of the now few prominent advocates of their system of medicine, and afford them a support which will enable them to withdraw their attention from their present incessant and necessary engagements, and apply those talents and that science and experience to the objects above sketched, thus enlarging their sphere of action and influence, and conferring on community, by their instructions and writings, blessings which, instead of being confined, as now, to a few individuals and a small space of country, may be commensurate with posterity and the habitable globe.

The resolution says that such an establishment is of the first importance. This point has been proved by showing that it will expose and explode error, and teach the true art of maintaining or restoring *health*, without which all other blessings may be compared to the loaves of bread hung before a man upon a gibbet.

It says further, that this measure is altogether expedient or feasible. This is true, because all that is wanting to effect it, is money, and no exorbitant portion of that. Let a judicious plan be proposed; let it be presented by men of talents, science, intelligence, polite address and moral worth, and there are, in this community, ten thousand purses whose clasps are ready to fly open at the gentle pressure of such hands. Men will not indeed give their money where they can see that no good shall result from the donation; but, let them see our object in its *true* light, as some men are able to present it, and the means to accomplish it will flow as freely and as plentifully as the mighty torrents of your noble rivers, in their pressure towards the ocean. I, therefore, Mr. President, move the acceptance of the preamble and resolution which I have presented and read, and on which I have commented.

---

### FURTHER REMARKS ON MEDICAL SCHOOLS.

Dr. Thomson has been often said to be an enemy to improvement. But, since our first acquaintance with him, we have been well satisfied that he would rejoice at either the detection and correction of any real error in his System or Practice, or the discovery of any remedial means more safe, simple and effectual in the removal of disease, than any article or compound which he recommends. The fact is, that his views on this subject are not understood.

I have discovered means and devised modes of curing disease, says the Doctor, far surpassing all

former example, both for simplicity and effect.— If any man will discover a better antispasmodic and emetic than No. 1, a better lever than No. 2, a better scourer than No. 3, or better restorers than Nos. 4, 5 and 6, of my System; or better aids to their operations than steam, nervine &c., I will cheerfully give place to them. But their superiority must be proved, *by their* producing a better effect when *used by themselves*, than mine do when used *without the improvements*. I cannot consent to give to *improvements* incorporated or combined with *my remedies and means*, the credit of effecting cures which mine are fully able to effect without aid; nor am I willing that my system should be charged with *failures* which have attended any practice in which other articles and means under the name of aids or improvements, have been introduced.

We do not say the above are the Doctor's words; but as they are in perfect accordance with his principles, with what we have ourselves heard him say, and with what he has sanctioned in the Manual, page 125, which says, he would "encourage" real improvers and "adopt their discoveries with pleasure," we are sure of his sanction. If such are his sentiments, who can object?

The Medical School will preserve sound theory and promote purity of practice in a great variety of ways.

1. It will gather together several gentlemen of talents and experience, and furnish them with a regular salary for their support; so that they can devote all their attention to teaching young men and disseminating, through them and the public journals, correct principles, and the most approved remedial means.

2. We have already hinted above, that a want of confidence in the Thomsonian System, and the introduction of imaginary aids and improvements, have been the means of casting discredit upon the practice where it has been introduced, and of retarding its progress to places where it has not.

Those medical professors will point out these errors, guard their pupils against them, and teach the public to discriminate between the true practice and the spurious.

3. The reason why the practice is sometimes adulterated and even abandoned for another, by those who profess, on the whole, to be its strong advocates, is, that they, being entirely ignorant of the principles of the mineral practice, are not aware of the danger of mingling the two. They know not that the action produced by the Botanic Practice, is calculated to give a fearful increase to the power of the deadly mineral drugs, beyond what they exert in the cold, inactive state in which they are ordinarily given—making what the doctors call “a safe dose,” prove a deadly potion if given with, or immediately *after* the Thomsonian remedies. By giving their pupils a condensed view of the old-school principles and remedies, and contrasting them with those of the new, the professors of the Botanic School will do much to destroy a mixed practice, and to induce a firm reliance on the pure Thomsonian Practice to the end.

4. The pupils of the Medical School will secure the confidence and patronage of the multitudes who now reject the Botanic Practice only because of the ignorance and inexperience of many who exercise it.



5. The possession of science and general intelligence, will enable the practitioner to exhibit the truth, simplicity and beauty of the Thomsonian System and Practice in their proper light, and thus remove the objections of educated persons against the ignorance of steam doctors, and to induce them to give it a candid and careful examination. This is all that is wanted to its universal adoption. It will soon prove itself to be profitable, that is, calculated to increase the wealth, not of a privileged order, but of the whole community, by saving a vast amount of suffering, time and money to the sick. Like temperance, it increases the wealth of its possessor, not so much by gathering more, as by saving what he has.

There are wealth and humanity enough among the Thomsonian Fraternity, to establish a dozen medical schools, which need only a judicious plan and a resolute beginning, to call them into action. Whatever fears some good friends of the cause may entertain of the tendency of medical schools, we are confident they will more thoroughly establish and extensively disseminate the pure Thomsonian System and Practice, than all other means which have yet been adopted.

We hope therefore, that all our Thomsonian friends will soon turn their attention to these subjects, and stand ready to build up schools and infirmaries, and supply them with pupils and patients, wherever they are needed. As we have no doubt that its friends east of the mountains will soon subscribe more money than will be wanted for the Baltimore school and Infirmary, and send it more pupils and patients than can be accommodated; we trust the Thomsonians in the West, will consider the difficulty and expense of sending pu-

pils across the Alleghanies, and contribute liberally to the encouragement of a similar institution in some of the cities or towns in the great Western Valley.

Infirmaries and their appendages are as necessary parts of the institution, as a well cultivated farm and ploughs, hoes &c., would be to a school for teaching the science of agriculture, or as an acquaintance with natural scenery, is, to give skill in landscape painting.

But, it may be asked, why the necessity of schools? Are not the Botanic papers and the United States and State Conventions, and especially the Branch Societies, able to preserve the purity of the practice, and to secure to the venerable founder, the just honor and reward that are due him for all his invaluable discoveries and for his philanthropic endeavors to bring these blessings within the reach of every suffering son and daughter of affliction? We answer,

As to the Botanic papers, we are sorry to say that, through a misguided spirit of liberality, towards every medical scheme that bears the name of "*Botanic*," the most of them are so much in the habit of recommending other "vegetable" systems and nostrums, that it were very unsafe to rely upon them as oracles of the Thomsonian faith and practice. But were they all what they should be, how few even of the Thomsonians read them!

To the United States Botanic Convention we did look for something of this sort, but we were sorry to find that they had adopted, on the recommendation of a committee of their number, without examination of the evidences of their correctness, grave charges against some persons who stand high in the Thomsonian ranks, together

with resolutions to pronounce Dr. Thomson's remedies inferior to some modern discoveries of certain "improvers upon his" system, and to express their approbation of Thomsonian students resorting to the "Reform Medical College at Worthington," whose "principles are the same as those of the mineral school;" whose practice includes the lancet, physic, and narcotic poisons, blisters and mercurial friction; and whose professors considered it a disgrace to their noble and scientific principles, to be mentioned in connexion with "the steam quackeries of the Thomsons and others."

The N. Y. State Convention abolishes the primary rule that one Thomsonian shall give advice to any and *every* other without fee or reward, and it cannot be supposed that county societies will be more vigilant than these.

The most intelligent and honest practitioners are too much engaged to spend time in correcting these abuses with their pens, and hence we must look to the professors in medical schools for the talents, knowledge, leisure and independence, necessary to correct all abuses and preserve the practice in its purity and power.

Dr. Thomson has expressed fears that schools would mystify the Theory of Medicine and destroy the simplicity of his practice and take it out of the hands of the people; but we assure him and all who entertain such fears, that we would be the last in the world to smother practical truth, under the rubbish of science, falsely so called; or to confine to a few the blessings suited to and designed for the many.

We devote our chief attention to the art of preserving health and curing disease. We neither teach nor propose to teach "sciences that have

nothing to do with medicine." All we teach of chemistry, as relating to medical poisons, is intended only to show the folly and wickedness of using the human body, as a crucible in which to perform experiments to show that one poison may be made to counterbalance or neutralize another. We teach the science of Botany, because it is the shortest and the most sure and certain way of becoming acquainted with your *materia medica*. We teach Anatomy, Physiology and Surgery, as secondary matters, because, as the Doctor says, [Guide, page 15,] they are "pleasing and useful," and there is no objection to this, "however minute and critical, if it is not to the neglect of first principles and the weightier matters of knowledge." He may rely upon it, *we* shall never teach a student to wait till he knows the scientific name, shape and uses of the obstructed, debilitated or injured organ, before he applies remedies that are well known to raise the vital energies, disengage all offending causes, and restore strength and integrity to the whole system.

But Dr. Thomson must not object to our teaching the "science of medicine" contained in his books, for he may rest assured that the editor of the Thomsonian Recorder, and proprietor of the Infirmary and School at Columbus, Ohio, is prepared to demonstrate, to the full satisfaction of any unprejudiced audience, literary, scientific or illiterate, that the system of medicine taught by Dr. Samuel Thomson, is *by far the most scientific that has ever yet appeared in the world*. This is what he does to *his* pupils, both in the Infirmary and Lecture Room.

Infirmarys and Schools will qualify men to apply the practice with effect, to defend it against the

assaults of its enemies, and to spread it among the intelligent portions of the community. We need not fear that they will shroud it in mystery, or encumber it with useless technicalities. There will always be among their and its advocates, discerning and honest men, in numbers and influence amply sufficient to preserve its simplicity and purity. We add only what we have said before, that these institutions will contribute more than all other means, to perpetuate the practice, and the memory of its illustrious founder.

---

*Botanico-Medical School at Columbus, Ohio.*

To many inquiries respecting our School, we would make the following general REPLY:

On the first of April we commenced the systematic and constant instruction of a class of young gentlemen, in the true Theory and Practice of Medicine. The principles of the science are clearly explained and illustrated, in so great a variety of ways as to fix them permanently in the mind. The practice in the house affords ample means of exhibiting to students the symptoms of disease, the *modus operandi* of medicines, and the various and most convenient and proper *ways* and *means* of rendering the remedial agents and the curative processes effectual.

The science of Botany is familiarly and practically taught in such a manner as not only to acquaint the student with the Botanic Materia Medica; but to enable him to examine the whole vegetable kingdom with pleasure and profit. It is illustrated, not merely by books and plates, but by anatomical examinations of the natural subjects, and by oral instructions in the field, as well as in the lecture room. Each student is taught to label and preserve plants for his future benefit.

Instructions are given and lectures delivered on Natural Philosophy and Chemistry. The Principles of Anatomy and Physiology are also taught, and comparisons drawn between the old school of medicine and the new. Much attention is devoted to Midwifery, and the Diseases of Women and Children.

Anatomy and Surgery receive all desirable attention, and the old theories and practices meet their just due, in a thorough examination, and comparison with the Botanic.

The Botanic Text Books, are, Dr. Thomson's Narrative and New Guide to Health, Dr. Robinson's Lectures, the Thomsonian Recorder, from the beginning; the Discussions between the Mineral and Botanic Faculties; A. C.'s Manuscript Lectures on the Science of Medicine, on Midwifery and the diseases peculiar to Women and Children; Eaton's Botany, Rafinesque's, &c.

Comstock's Natural Philosophy and Chemistry.

The best text books on Anatomy, Surgery, Physiology, Pathology, Therapeutics, and every other branch of "Medical Science," falsely so called, are contained in our library, to which the student may have reference; but he must purchase for his own use, at least one standard work on each of the subjects to which he devotes particular attention.

### TERMS.

We have a select and valuable Library, and a room in which lectures and instructions are given. For the use of these and the regular tuition, one dollar per week, or fifty dollars per year, are charged. Students are boarded at the School for three dollars per week, at other places in the city for \$2 50 and \$2 and, perhaps, for less. Payable quarterly in advance, with cash or good security.

From 6 to 18 months are desirable to acquire a thorough knowledge of the Botanic Practice. A minute acquaintance with Anatomy, Surgery, and other branches of the old theories and practices, demand a longer period.

---

*Dr. Bigelow, of the Harvard University, a Thomsonian!*—Not exactly so yet, reader, but we expect that he soon will be, for he has taken an important step this way. See his address lately delivered to the Massachusetts Medical Society. We have not the address itself before us; our remarks are predicated on extracts from it, which we find in the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal. The editor of that paper says, this discourse “is manifestly a departure from the common order of addresses, containing something practically useful to the physician.” This is a sort of declaration that, in most medical discourses, there is little, if any thing, useful to a physician; perhaps it is so, but, in what, reader, do you think this practical usefulness consists? Simply in acknowledging that, though “the structure and functions of the human body, the laws which govern the progress of its diseases, and more especially the diagnosis of its morbid conditions, are better understood now than they were at the beginning of the present century;” yet “the science of therapeutics, or the branch of knowledge by the application of which physicians are expected to remove diseases, has not, seemingly, attained to a much more elevated standing than it formerly possessed. The records of mortality attest its frequent failures, and the inability to control the event of diseases which at times is felt by the most gifted and experienced practitioners, give evidence that

in many cases, disease is more easily understood than cured."

The Editor of the Journal says, "this is a plain statement of facts, however mortifying it must be to those who boast of their skilful application of remedies; and it is honest too." The Doctor continues: "This deficiency of the healing art, is not justly attributable to *any want of sagacity or diligence* on the part of the medical profession. [No, *they cannot* be wrong.] It belongs rather to the inherent difficulties of the case, and is, *after abating the effects of errors and accidents*, to be ascribed to the apparent fact that certain morbid processes in the human body, have *a definite and necessary career*, from which they are not to be diverted by any known agents with which it is in our power to oppose them." These "morbid processes," the Doctor calls "self-limited diseases."

Now, Doctor, before we proceed farther, permit us very respectfully to reason a little with you. We say, very respectfully, for we highly respect your talents, attainments and moral worth, though we presume to question the soundness of your logic.

We are sure you will agree with us that the first step to improvement is to discover and unlearn our errors; and the next is to predicate all our reasoning upon *correct* postulates, or unquestionable bases. For example, were we to say that no cause is designed to produce any particular effect, and thereupon undertake to prove that any given effect may be attributed to one cause as well as another, the conclusion would be manifestly wrong, while the reasoning would be logical. To correct the error, therefore, we must return to the postulate. But, Doctor, the above is exactly your mode of reasoning. You lay it



down as a position not to be controverted, that you know all about the human body and the nature and progress of disease, and thereupon argue that you ought to know and do know how to cure all curable diseases; and that, what you do not cure, are not to be cured by any known process. Yet you are compelled to acknowledge the fact, that many of those diseases which you can neither cure nor check by all your art, are often easily and entirely removed by the sanative operations of the system alone. (And you might have added, with truth, that many others which the faculty have considered limitable only by death, have been entirely eradicated by the renovating energies of the Botanic Practice.)

In the Prospectus of the Cyclopædia of Practical Medicine, Dr. Hays says, and we presume you will endorse it, "the main object of medicine is the preventing and curing of diseases." You say, in substance, we know all about the human frame, the nature and progress of disease, the medical properties of remedies, what effects they are calculated to aid, and what to counteract; and yet it is mere luck and chance, depending on some secret states or operations of the system, that we cure disease at all. (For it is a melancholy fact that some patients die under your practice, of almost every form of disease to which the ingenuity of man has given a name, while others recover from the most deadly attacks of the most dangerous forms of disease in the whole dread catalogue, with all the artificial bleeding, blistering, physicking, probing and starving which the most savage barbarity could inflict.) We know how to give a poison to counteract a poison; and yet, in practice, we must "abate" our numerous "errors" of giving the one when the other is not present, and there-

by killing the patient which the uninterrupted operations of the *vis medicalrix naturæ* might have healed!

That we do not misrepresent you in stating your argument to be predicated on the strange postulate that "a given effect may be the product of one cause as well as another," we appeal to your practice. When the remedies you first apply do not produce the desired effect, you try others, and others (almost *ad infinitum*) of character and effects very different from, and often directly the reverse of those you tried at first, though you admit that the disease is the same. For example, (excuse our plainness for the benefit of our less scientific readers,) you first bleed, blister, physick and starve a fever, and when you find that this process is likely to kill the *patient* instead of the *fever*, you turn about and use food and stimuli. Does not the use, in the same disease, of so many remedies of opposite nature and effects, prove incontestibly, whether you acknowledge it or not, that you consider it as likely to have proceeded from one cause as another? What would your old Greek friend Aristotle think of the logic which you have exhibited in the above quotation?

But, sir, you have no doubt perceived ere this, not only that your logic is unsound, but that its rottenness lies in the position which you have assumed in the beginning, viz. that you are acquainted with "the functions of the human body and the laws which govern the progress of its diseases." On this subject, we contend that the medical faculty are more in the dark than they are in therapeutics or the art of removing diseases—where they sometimes do hit the mark, though they know not why; whereas, in their theory of the nature and progress of disease, they are sys-

tematically and always wrong. This is a grave charge, but we are prepared to prove it. Before we do so, however, it will be convenient to take notice of succeeding positions in your "Discourse."

"By a self-limited disease," you mean "one which receives limits from its own nature, and not from foreign influences; one which, after it has obtained foothold in the system, cannot, in the present state of our knowledge, be *eradicated* or *abridged* by art, but to which there is due a certain succession of processes, to be completed in a certain time; which processes may vary with the constitution and condition of the patient, and may tend to death or recovery, but are not known to be shortened or greatly changed by medical treatment."

This is a very fair and candid acknowledgment, Doctor, but it contains only one truth, viz. that "there is due to these diseases a certain succession of processes, to be completed in a time which varies with the constitution and condition of the patient." All the rest is folly; else all your knowledge, experience and services, are vain—yea worse than vain, in almost every case of disease: for, you well know, that all the argument the faculty can offer to justify the use of "substances whose tendency is fatal to vitality," and which, if any thing, they are sure to use, is, that they counteract the deadly virus and stimulate the system to the rejection of that which would otherwise prove fatal to the patient. Thus, they give tartar emetic to expel the suicidal dose of laudanum; arsenic to cure the ague and the cancer, mercury for dyspepsia &c. &c. Now, if these "cannot abridge nor eradicate" the disease, we know they do most seriously injure the constitution, and,

therefore, it is our bounden duty, as it is our highest interest, (as you have the *candor* virtually to acknowledge,) to beware of all interference with the medical faculty! But stop, we will not go quite so far yet. We will wait till we ascertain what the diseases are which you call *self-limited*.

"It is difficult to select a perfectly satisfactory or convincing example of a self-limited disease from among the graver morbid affections, because, in these affections, the *solicitude of the practitioner usually leads him to the employment of remedies, in consequence of which the effect of remedies is mixed up with the phenomena of disease, so that the mind has difficulty in separating them.*" This is a solemn truth, Doctor, and the mind that has had the sagacity to discern, and the courage to confess it, will not stop here. It is this mixture of the effects of your remedies with the phenomena of the disease, that makes the symptoms, under your treatment, appear so different, and continue so much longer than they do under the Botanic, and it is this *diseased* knowledge, if we may so speak, of the indications of disease, and the evidences of returning health, which you obtain from watching the patient through the several stages of your process from the commencement of the attack to final recovery, that renders you so incapable of judging of the real nature and character of the progress of disease and of recovery under the Thomsonian treatment; the speedy and powerful effects of which you attribute to improper causes and pronounce injurious; and hence all the odium and calumny popularly attached to steam, lobelia and cayenne pepper; articles so valuable in themselves that the small quantities you use in your practice, with all your abuse of them, do more

good than all your other remedial agents put together. But to return to the quotation.

"We must, therefore, seek for our most striking or decisive examples among those diseases which are sufficiently mild not to be thought to require ordinarily the use of remedies, and in which the natural history of the disease may be observed, divested of foreign influences. Such examples are found in the vaccine disease, the chicken pox, and the *salivation produced by mercury*.

These are strictly self-limited diseases, having their own rise, climax and decline, and I know of no *medical practice*, which is able, were it deemed necessary, to divert them from their appropriate course, or to hasten their termination."

This last declaration, the editor of the Journal says is "bold but nevertheless true; and yet he (Dr. Bigelow) is the only eminent practitioner who has had the boldness to assert it in this country!" As much as to say, *we* and perhaps a thousand others have long known the fact—(it is nevertheless true) but we had neither the independence of spirit nor the moral honesty to confess it, nor even print it in our journal till it came from an eminent practitioner whose popularity is able to sustain both himself and us! The French Physicians have long been aware of the danger of meddling with diseases whose nature and progress they do not understand, and hence they reject almost *toto celo* our heroic remedies and content themselves with recommending light and nourishing diet, which, giving the digestive organs little to do, allow and aid them to exert all their energies against the disease which generally soon yields to their salutary action. We dared not attempt to stir this ponderous rock from its bed, for fear of the vengeance of some of the *big ones*; but

now, one of their number has started it, we are safe in lending him our aid to keep it in motion. "The closing remark," says the editor, "in which the idea is advanced that the services of a physician are useless, is quite as startling to us as it would be to a patient in the last stages of disease, to be told that he must trust entirely to luck for recovery."

Startling as it may be to you, Mr. Editor, patients treated as they generally are, begin with good reason to believe the fact, whether they are told it or not; and not a few, fully persuaded that the luck is altogether against them, refuse all aid from the wisdom of the schools, trusting entirely to the salutary operations of nature and the little aid which they know how to give. But to the Doctor again.

You have given the names of several diseases which you call self-limited. If, now, you would be so good as to tell us what is the minimum or shortest period of their limit, we should have the means of testing the correctness of your conclusions. You say the "*whooping* cough has its regular increase, height and decline, occupying ordinarily from one to six months. During this period medical treatment is for the most part of no avail."

Now, Doctor, we venture the assertion that, had you possessed the independence and candor, as well as "sagacity" to examine impartially the merits of the Thomsonian practice, and to apply it skilfully and perseveringly to this disease, you would have been able, ere this, to reduce your months to weeks if not to days.

The whooping cough is caused by cold phlegm adhering to the bronchiæ and their dependents, which phlegm, unaided by art, the system finds it

a tedious and difficult task to disengage. A judicious application of steam and cayenne will heat and dissolve that phlegm; lobelia will relax and expand the vessels in which it is lodged, and all these and some others will stimulate the whole system to an action sufficient to disengage entirely the offending cause. The time required will, as you very justly remark, still depend "on the condition of the patient;" that is, the degree of temperature to which the system is raised and continued, and on "the constitution," which always aids the process in proportion to its strength.—The idea that the termination of this disease cannot be hastened by medical treatment, is certainly not less astonishing to us than to the Editor of the Journal.

"Most of the class of diseases usually denominated eruptive fevers, are self-limited. *Measles*, for example, is never known to be cut short by art, or abridged of its natural character. *Scarlet fever*, a disease of which we have had much and fatal experience during the three last years, is eminently of this character. *Small pox* is another example. It may, at first view, appear that inoculation has placed artificial limits on this disease. But it must be recollected that inoculated small pox is itself only a milder variety of the same disease, having its own customary limits of extent and duration which are fixed quite as much as those of the distinct and confluent forms of the natural disease.

*Erysipelas* is an eruptive fever, having strong analogies with those which have been detailed. It is not certain that art can very materially affect either the duration or extent of this malady."

Perhaps, Doctor, you have not determined

the shortest time that these maladies require to finish their course. We will aid you a little in this matter.

During the past winter we cured from twenty-five to thirty cases of measles, none of which except three or four in patients afflicted with other diseases, required more than four days to effect a perfect cure; and in many the disease was completely disengaged in two days, no trace but the desquamation remaining. The only cases we lost, were patient also in the last stage of consumption, and an infant to which we were called after a week's relapse, and which was then sinking in the arms of death. We have treated many cases of scarlet fever without ever losing a patient.—In several instances we have thrown out the virus and entirely cured the patient in the short space of twelve hours. In one instance, the patient lost but a single meal of victuals, and not one hour from her labor, though she had both the scarlet fever and the sore throat! We have no doubt, Doctor, that "this form of disease has a certain course to run," but we assure you, that the steam practice will drive it through that course, as much faster than yours will, as the same vapor will propel cars on a rail-road, faster than the plodding ox can drag through the mud the ponderous wagons of the olden time.

"Erysipelas," says Hooper, "is known by synocha of two or three days continuance, with drowsiness and sometimes delirium; pulse commonly full and hard; then erythema of the face, or some other part, with continuance of synocha, tending either to abscess or gangrene."

"It is remarkable that erysipelas sometimes returns periodically, attacking the patients once or twice a year, or even once every month," &c.



The worst case we have treated was one of the vesiculose species, of this periodical character.

"Where the erysipelas attacks the face, it comes on with a chilliness, succeeded by heat, restlessness, thirst, and other febrile symptoms, with a drowsiness or tendency to coma, and the pulse very frequent and full.

Such was the condition of the patient when we were called to prescribe.

"The treatment" says Hooper, "must proceed on the antiphlogistic plan, varied in activity, according to the type of the disease."

We commenced, however, a treatment the very reverse; gave heating stimulants which, in a few hours, cut out several days of "the progress of the disease" as described by Hooper, bringing out the "large blisters" at once. To these we instantly applied (all over the face) hot and moist, stimulating poultices, inviting and absorbing the virus which was forced out so fast by "diffusive stimulants" that in two or three days the patient was entirely well, and has not since been attacked!—The attack, the preceding spring, had lasted her several months, under the antiphlogistic treatment recommended by Hooper. Is it common for this self-limited disease to become so much lighter and more easily eradicated, after three or four periodical returns, as to account for the difference of duration here exhibited, consistently with your views of the subject?

"It is a question of great interest to the medical profession, to determine whether typhus is a disease susceptible of control by medical means. No one doubts that, if the disease is once fairly established in the system, it cannot be eradicated by art, but must complete a certain natural course before convalescence can take place. But the ques-

tion is, whether this disease is capable of being jugulated or broken up at its outset, by the early application of remedies."

Our limits forbidding to be more particular we will just remark now, Doctor, for your present benefit; that we have treated almost all the forms of fever in your formidable catalogues, typhus among the rest, but, in nearly three years practice, we never have allowed *any* one to baffle our skill for twelve hours!

We hope, when we see the remainder of the discourse, to find a table of the maximum and minimum periods that each of the self-limited diseases is allowed to run.

To conclude these remarks whose length is justified only by the vast importance of the subject, we must explain the hint thrown out in the beginning, that you might yet become a Thomsonian. You, sir, see and acknowledge the defects of the systems of the schools, in the accomplishment of the grand object (the healing of the sick) for which you have devoted to their attainment the energies of your youth and the mature strength of riper years. With your venerable neighbor, Dr. Waterhouse, you have become "sick of learned quackery." As it is not the characteristic of a great mind, to sit down in despair after disappointment in any pursuit, so we expect that, like him, you will look about you and "take some interest in observing the effects of humane and strong-minded empiricism, which has done more for the healing art than all the schools of physic since the days of Paracelsus;" and we are sure that, if you once drop your hold of the confused, discordant and deceptive theories of those schools, turn your back upon them and look about you with an eye ready to observe and a heart willing to receive the truth



To prove it, he says;

‘ An honest Wabster to his trade,  
Whase wife’s twa nieves were scarce weel bred,  
Gat tippence worth to mend her head

When it was sair;

The wife slade cannie to her bed,

But ne’er spak mair.

‘ A kintry laird had ta’en the batts,  
Or some curmurring in his gutts,  
His only son for *Hornbook* sets,

An pays him well;

The lad, for twa guid gimmer pets,

Was laird himsel’.

‘ A bonnie lass, ye kend her name,  
Some ill-brewn drink had hov’d her wame;  
She trusts hersel’, to hide the shame,

In *Hornbook’s* care;

*Horn* sent her aff to her lang hame,

To hide it there.

‘ That’s just a swatch o’ *Hornbook’s* way ;  
Thus goes he on from day to day ;  
Thus does he poison, kill and slay,

An’s weel paid for’t;

Yet stops me o’ my lawfu’ prey,

Wi’ his vile dirt.”

If the above favors Dr. Medicus, he is heartily  
welcome to all its beneficial influence.—ED.

## CONTENTS.

### DISCUSSIONS IN MARYLAND.

	PAGE
Dr. Williams's speech on the Bill to incorporate the Thomsonian National Infirmary, H. of D. Maryland 1835,	5
Dr. Curtis's Reply to do.	19
Refusal of the B. M. S. Journal to admit it, 36-7	

### DISCUSSIONS IN NORTH CAROLINA.

Rev. Mr. Daniel's Certificate,	38
Comments of "Medicus," or Dr. Bettner,	40
Answer of Botanist, or Dr. Curtis,	53
Reply of Medicus or Dr. Bettner,	63
Second reply of Botanist, or Dr. Curtis,	70
Omar's first essay,	78
Contributions of a country subscriber,	80
Quackery, from The Pa. Inquirer,	81
Reply of Botanist to the above,	82
Remarks of "Agricola,"	90
Lecture delivered in Baltimore, by Dr. A. Curtis,	93, 117
Cholera Practice,	109
Thomsonian Surgery,	123
Value of Steam,	127

### CONTROVERSY IN GEORGIA, 139

Introduction by Equity,	140
Note by the Editor of the F. U.	142
"Remarks" on the preceding Lectures, by Dr. Edward Deloney of Talbotton, Ga.	143
Reply of Dr. Curtis,	168

Dr. Deloney's answer,	201
Rejoinder of Dr. Curtis,	227
Warden to Dr. Deloney,	240
Dr. Deloney to Warden,	241
Warden's Reply,	246
Dr. Deloney's Rejoinder,	247
"Equity's" first reply to Dr. Deloney,	249
Dr. Deloney's Reply,	262
Equity's Farewell,	264
Eveliegh's (M. D.) Advertisement,	281
"Medicus" or Dr. Deloney's exit,	287
"Medicus Senior,"	290

## APPENDIX.

Notes on Dr. Williams's Speech,	301
Review of Trials of Thomsonians, in Ha- gerstown, Maryland,	303
Further notes on Dr. Williams's Speech,	313
Principles of the B. M. and S. Journal,	317
Letter of Dr. Elliot,	329
Omar's reply to Botanist, with answers,	330
Dr. J. H. Miller's "Thompsonalgia Report,"	335
Infirmary Practice,	351
Thomsonian Intemperance,	357
Botanico-Medical Schools,	359—60—62, 376
Review of Dr. Bigelow's, Address,	385
Medical laws—	20—22, 257—260, 293—301
“	“ 303—313
Medical School at Columbus,	383
Death and Dr. Hornbook,	397
The nature, improvement and use of reason,	“ “ 93—104
The Thomsonian Practice,	117—122, 370
The Science of Medicine,	132, 369
Botanic Principles,	372
Regular Plan,	372







Med Hist

WZ

270

C977d

1836

C.1

